

the Palarm Creek in Faulkner and Pulaski Counties, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1480. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 24, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Hatchie River and tributaries, Mississippi and Tennessee, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1481. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 1, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Toro Negro River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1482. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to \$30,412, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 amounting to \$2,840,000, in all, \$2,870,412 (H. Doc. No. 662); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1483. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1942, three totaling \$7,350,000 to remain available until June 30, 1943, and one for \$4,200,000 to remain available until expended; in all, \$11,550,000 (H. Doc. No. 663); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1484. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to \$1,670,000 (H. Doc. No. 664); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1485. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SANDERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1971. An act to legalize a bridge across Bayou Lafourche at Valentine, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1888). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TENEROWICZ: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2133. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the Lower Peninsula of Michigan," approved September 25, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1889). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TENEROWICZ: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2134. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St.

Marys River from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada," approved December 16, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 1890). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALLECK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6080. A bill authorizing the county of Lawrence, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near St. Francisville, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1891). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6495. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center; with amendment (Rept. No. 1892). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6730. A bill to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRIEST:  
H. R. 6765. A bill authorizing the President to require persons deferred under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to perform civilian service of importance to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:  
H. R. 6766. A bill to permit officers of the Army and Navy, commissioned since December 7, 1941, to continue to hold their civil offices while on active duty during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARSON:  
H. R. 6767. A bill abolishing the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANDIS:  
H. R. 6768. A bill authorizing the President to appoint persons to guard plants, material, and utilities necessary to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H. R. 6769. A bill to provide for the seizure of nonessential aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:  
H. R. 6776. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON:  
H. R. 6777. A bill to further protect the rights of individual employees under the National Labor Relations Act through denying certain representatives and labor organizations their status and benefits as such under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COLLINS:  
H. Res. 455. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be a consolidation of Federal agencies concerned with the production of natural and synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 6770. A bill to correct an error to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6771. A bill for the relief of Roy Delavergne; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6772. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cora B. Jones and James C. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6773. A bill for the relief of Jean Rudnikoff Bloomstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6774. A bill for the relief of Ruth Rudnikoff Stotland; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 6775. A bill for the relief of Cornelia Hunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2550. By Mr. ANDERSON of California: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of San Benito County, Calif., urging the evacuation and concentration of all Japanese and their descendants to a concentration camp under supervision of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2551. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of sundry citizens of Kings Mountain, Cleveland County, N. C., favoring Senate bill 860 or House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, who art the Guide and Leader of the generations of men, who hast called us with our limitations to be joyful inheritors of the wonder and glory of Thy Kingdom: We humbly acknowledge our utter unworthiness of Thy mercies, and confess how little we have done to exalt in freedom and fullness the faith of our fathers, brought to us through so many perils, purchased with such sacrifice.

Forgive us our long neglect of this our bounden duty, our past unfaithfulness, our deafness to Thy call, with its consequent neglect of opportunities. Give to our Nation power to face with courage the issues of this present time that she may go forth daringly, trusting in the leadership Thou dost inspire, and, unfettered by the past, may one day bring the nations of the world into that perfection which is the Father's will. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are holding hearings in Western States on matters pertaining to national defense.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is holding hearings in the West on silver, and therefore is unable to be present.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is a member of the Senate committee holdings hearings in the West on matters pertaining to the national defense, and is therefore unable to be present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Massa-

chusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### THE LATE J. FRED ESSARY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last evening there passed away from Washington and the national scene a gentleman who for 30 years has been associated with the press of the National Capital, Mr. J. Fred Essary. He was the dean of most of the correspondents, if not the dean of them all, in point of service, and for 30 years represented the Baltimore Sun in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Essary wrote his articles over his own signature. I think they will be conceded to be articles written without passion or prejudice and with that degree of detachment and fact which is the aim of all outstanding journalists.

Mr. Essary was a man in whom any officeholder, either elected or appointed, could put absolute trust; they could tell him of events and news, or of coming events, and the confidence would be implicitly respected.

He was a former president of the Gridiron Club and of the National Press Club, and entered into all the interesting activities of those organizations which from time to time provide wholesome entertainment for the benefit of those of us who are associated in an officeholding way with the National Government.

Because of Mr. Essary's ability as an outstanding newspaperman, because of his long and distinguished service, and because of his high rank among those of his own profession and the high regard in which he was held by all Members of the Congress and generally by officials in Washington, I rise to express my deep regret, which I believe is universally shared, that he has passed from the scene of his brilliant activities.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ANDREW FURUSETH

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this day is the anniversary of the birth of the late Andrew Furuseth, one of the most outstanding labor leaders whom it has ever been my privilege to know. I am sure the Members of the Senate who have served long in this body will remember him and his tireless and effective work in behalf of the men who follow the sea.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the minutes of a meeting of the Friends of Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association, of New York City. I call particular attention to that portion of the minutes which contains the call which Mr. Furuseth, who at that time was president of the International Seamen's Union, issued to all seafaring men ashore and afloat shortly after our entrance into the World War in 1917. I think it is very apt and appropriate that we should read this call in the light of the events which are happening today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the minutes will be printed in the RECORD.

The minutes are as follows:

Members of this organization are gathered together on this 12th day of March 1942 to observe and commemorate the eighty-eighth birthday of a great American, Andrew Furuseth, leader of seamen, who died January 24, 1938, and whose ashes were buried at sea March 21, 1938.

Be it remembered that not only did he lead seamen in their successful fight to abolish arrest for desertion on American ships wherever they are on the high seas, but that he won freedom for seamen of foreign countries likewise when they are in waters of the United States.

We commemorate the birthday, life, and work of Andrew Furuseth for his sincerity, his personal integrity, the simplicity of his life, intensity of his work, and his selflessness as to material things. That his life and work have been an inspiration to seamen is proven by the fact that at this time, when the liberties of landmen and seamen alike are threatened by the powers of evil and darkness in the fight for material things which would make slave of all men, the merchant ships of the United States and of the United Nations are kept moving. In spite of the great risks, the terrific loss of lives due to the violation of international laws and laws of human decency in the matter of sinking vessels without warning, seamen of the world have not abandoned their calling, are not deserting, are not flinching, and we repeat, in the hope that these minutes will be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of our great country, what Andrew Furuseth said in his message to seamen on the occasion of the last World War, 1917:

"A CALL TO THE SEA—TO ALL SEAFARING MEN  
ASHORE OR AFLOAT

"The Nation that proclaimed your freedom now needs your services. America is at war. Our troops are being transported over the seas. Munitions and supplies are being shipped in ever-increasing quantities to our armies in Europe. The bases are the ports of America. The battlefields are in Europe. The sea intervenes. Over it the men of the sea must sail the supply ships. A great emergency fleet is now being built. Thousands of skilled seamen, seafaring men of all capacities who left the sea in years gone by as a protest against the serfdom from which no flag then offered relief, have now an opportunity to return to their former calling—sail as freemen and serve our country.

"Your old shipmates—men who remained with the ship to win the new status for our craft—now call upon you to again stand by for duty. Your help is needed to prove that no enemy on the seas can stop the ships of the Nation whose seamen bear the responsibility of liberty.

"America has the right, a far greater right than any other nation, to call upon the seamen of all the world for service. By responding to this call now you can demonstrate your practical appreciation of freedom won."

—ANDREW FURUSETH.

"MAY 1, 1917."

Today our troops are in the Far East, Iceland, Europe, and South America. Our oil tankers are being sunk without warning, but the seamen are not flinching.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., protesting against the alleged action and method followed by the Governor of the Virgin Islands in securing the adoption of an amendment to the organic act of the Virgin

<sup>1</sup> Seamen's Act of March 4, 1915 (popularly known as the La Follette Act), Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection Service.



Islands without first informing or advising with the legislative assembly or the municipal councils of the Virgin Islands relative to his intention and obtaining the views of the people of the islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

A resolution of the Senate of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

**"Senate Resolution 1**

"Whereas the totalitarian powers, with a decided purpose to destroy democracy throughout the world in order to establish a regime of violence, insecurity, and oppression, have extended their devastating war to the American Hemisphere;

"Whereas after the brutal and treacherous attacks on the naval base of Pearl Harbor and the Philippine Islands the Congress of the United States declared the existence of a state of war with the totalitarian powers;

"Whereas in the present conflict, which at this time already includes all the nations of the earth, the fate of democracy in the world is involved, the totalitarian powers striving to annihilate it definitely as an ideal of life and of government, and all free nations being bound in a common effort to insure its subsistence in order to save with it the conquests of civilization, the spiritual values of humanity, and the right of man to liberty, security, and peace;

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico, because of their close relations with the people and the Government of the United States and their devotion to the cause of democracy, are absolutely identified with the great American Nation in this struggle for the subsistence of liberty and right;

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico are ready to make the utmost contribution of men and effort and to suffer whatever sacrifices may be necessary in order to fight beside the people and the Government of the United States in this transcendental struggle until the totalitarian powers are definitely defeated and the bases of a regime of justice and security for all nations are firmly established; and

"Whereas interpreting the sentiment of loyalty of our people to the American Nation and their solidarity of purpose in the fight begun, the Legislature of Puerto Rico today, the opening of its second regular session of the Fifteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, considers it its duty to make these feelings public and to fix its historical position in this great struggle for the cause of democracy, pledging its best efforts for the triumph thereof: Now, therefore, be it

**"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico:**

"First. To express, as it is hereby expressed, the solidarity of the people of Puerto Rico with the people and the Government of the United States of America in the struggle against the totalitarian powers undertaken to safeguard democracy in the world.

"Second. To pledge, as they are hereby pledged, all the resources and efforts of the people of Puerto Rico to carry forward the war until the total destruction of the military power of the totalitarian forces and the vigorous affirmation of liberty and democracy as standards of life for all peoples.

"Third. To testify, as it is hereby testified, to the administration of the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the profound identification of our people with his efforts in favor of these great ideals of humanity.

"Fourth. To send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico to the United States."

By Mr. CAPPER:

Resolutions forwarded by Howard Barber, of Courtland, Kans., and adopted and signed

by numerous farmers of western Republic County, Kans., protesting against the operation of the agricultural adjustment program and favoring repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Emporia, Kans., favoring the adoption of a "work or fight" policy in the Nation during the present war emergency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
"COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,  
"March 11, 1942.

**"House Resolution 72**

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Senate of the United States of America to enact into law a bill relating to labor disputes in defense industries, and urging the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY and the Honorable ALBERT B. CHANDLER, Senators from Kentucky, to support the bill

"Whereas the United States is now engaged in a war in which continued and uninterrupted production of war materials will be a vital factor in the attainment of ultimate victory; and

"Whereas the youth of America, comprising our armed forces now engaged in a life and death struggle with the enemy, are in desperate need of the arms and munitions of war with which to bring about our complete victory; and

"Whereas strikes and work stoppages in defense industries are impeding the manufacture of such arms and munitions: Therefore be it

**"Resolved by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:**

"SECTION 1. That the Senate of the United States of America be petitioned to enact into law an act which would require a 30-day notice to be given by employees of a defense contractor before a strike or lock-out is called and a secret vote before a strike is conducted in a defense industry, prohibit a defense contractor from denying employment to any person because of his membership or nonmembership in a labor union, and the use of violence or intimidation in labor disputes in defense industries, limit pickets to persons who were employees of a defense contractor prior to the beginning of the labor dispute, and prohibit jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, and sympathy strikes where defense contracts are involved.

"SEC. 2. That the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY and the Honorable ALBERT B. CHANDLER be urged to use their personal efforts to secure the action contemplated in section 1.

"SEC. 3. That the secretary of state be directed to certify copies of this resolution to the Chief Clerk of the Senate of the United States, and to the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY and the Honorable ALBERT B. CHANDLER, representatives from Kentucky in the United States Senate.

"This resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives on February 18, 1942, and was concurred in by the Senate of Kentucky on February 20, 1942.

"Attest:

"W. A. PERRY,  
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1991. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Meister; with amendments (Rept. No. 1158);

H. R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Onie Martin and Betty Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159);

H. R. 4657. A bill for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1161);

H. R. 5652. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160); and

H. R. 5887. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Miller; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1162).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of L. H. Goodman; with amendments (Rept. No. 1164);

S. 1648. A bill for the relief of the Shaver Forwarding Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1165); and

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others; with amendments (Rept. No. 1163).

**EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE**

Mr. McKELLAR, as in executive session, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the nomination of Richard Irvin, of Pennsylvania, to be Work Projects administrator for Pennsylvania, effective March 1, 1942.

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and, referred as follows:

By Mr. REED:

S. 2365. A bill to prohibit discrimination with respect to employment in the service of the United States or employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2366. A bill to provide for the decentralized settlement and payment of damage claims arising from activities of the Army, other than in foreign countries; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2367. A bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918; and

S. 2368. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCFARLAND:

S. 2369. A bill for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

**HOUSE BILL REFERRED**

The bill (H. R. 6736) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

**ADDITIONAL CLERK IN THE DISBURSING OFFICE**

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 230), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

**Resolved,** That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to employ a clerk for service in the disbursing office of the Senate at the rate of \$2,220 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON PROFITS, PICKETS, AND PARITY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject Profits, Pickets, and Parity, delivered by him at the National Republican Club on March 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY ON WAR PRODUCTION BY SMALL BUSINESS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address delivered by him at a meeting of the American Business Congress, New York City, March 10, 1942, on affording small business concerns opportunities for war production, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS IN WAR PRODUCTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from Meyer Jacobstein, of the Brookings Institution, relating to the utilization of small business firms in the national production program, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SMALL BUSINESS AND THE WAR PRODUCTION PROGRAM—EDITORIAL AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Washington Star of March 9, 1942, together with a statement by himself, regarding Senate bill 2250, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### T. P. & W. RAILROAD STRIKE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a history of the T. P. & W. strike, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SINKING OF REFUGEE SHIP "STRUMA"

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a telegram and memorandum relative to the sinking of the refugee ship *Struma*, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### FACILITIES OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of March 12, 1942, by Gould Lincoln, on the subject of the facilities of the Office of Government Reports, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WAR SPIRIT IN DETROIT—ARTICLE FROM DETROIT FREE PRESS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Detroit Free Press of March 11, 1942, entitled "I Will Do My Best," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### RETURN OF GOVERNMENT BENEFIT PAYMENTS BY INDIANA FARMERS

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article from the Decatur (Ind.) Daily Democrat of March 9, 1942, entitled "Farmers Pledge Not To Receive Payments," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REQUISITION OF TIRES AND DESTRUCTION OF CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS MATERIAL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I understand that Price Administrator Leon Henderson has announced that it may be necessary to requisition tires from private owners for use of the armed forces. How far Administrator Henderson intends to go with this program I do not know. It may be that he has his program well in hand. If so, I am certain that American

citizens will want an explanation from him of the outrageous destruction of C. C. C. materials which has taken place in some of the camps in Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks the news article of Gerson H. Lush published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, March 8, 1942, which portrays but a small part of what will be found in the way of extravagance in Government departments when a full examination is made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 8, 1942]

**VITAL DEFENSE MATERIALS WRECKED AS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS CAMPS ARE ABANDONED; NEW CLOTHES AND BLANKETS BURNED—TWO HUNDRED TRUCKS LEFT IN FIELD TO RUST; TOOLS LYING IDLE**

(By Gerson H. Lush)

Valuable and vital defense material—much of it irreplaceable—is being wrecked by the Federal Civilian Conservation Corps in the abandonment of some of its camps in Pennsylvania, it was learned yesterday.

There are Civilian Conservation Corps camps in 47 other States where the Civilian Conservation Corps is retrenching.

While the civilian supply of all-wool clothes is dwindling, the Civilian Conservation Corps has burned brand-new, unpacked stocks of long underwear. The same goes for Civilian Conservation Corps uniforms, oilskin raincoats, arctics, and other rubber overshoes, and even Army blankets.

While the War Production Board is attempting to utilize all "surplus materials," Civilian Conservation Corps storehouses are loaded to the ceilings with brand-new tools.

While Price Administrator Leon Henderson has announced it might be necessary to requisition tires from private owners for use of the armed forces, there is one Civilian Conservation Corps storehouse packed with at least 1,200 good truck tires, some of them virtually new.

#### TWO HUNDRED TRUCKS UNCARED FOR

While autos and trucks are being rationed, the Civilian Conservation Corps is permitting more than 200 usable trucks to rot in open fields—unprotected from the severe winter weather.

While there is a shortage of road equipment, 23 graders and 9 caterpillar tractors are wasting away in the same manner.

This reporter saw the trucks and tires and tools.

He saw some of the clothes saved from the fire pile, although he did not see the wanton destruction which took place last week at Camp S-51, Pine Grove Furnace, Cumberland County.

However, citizens in the camp area are up in arms about the wasteful burning. They even asked why the clothes, especially the underwear, raincoats, and arctics couldn't have been turned over to the Civilian Conservation Corps for the armed forces.

They are also asking why the Civilian Conservation Corps is holding onto the tools, trucks, and other equipment needed in defense work elsewhere.

#### TRUCKS STRIPPED OF TIRES

At Camp S-51, which was abandoned recently, there are 176 trucks, ranging from one-half to five tons; the 1,200 tires mentioned above; the 23 graders and 9 caterpillar tractors. Also a shed full of tools.

In a self-made "graveyard" atop a mountain at Cooks Run, Clinton County, are 78 more trucks.

Eight smaller Civilian Conservation Corps camps throughout the State are now in the

process of demobilization. Each camp has 12 trucks.

Incidentally, the 1,200 tires at Camp S-51 come from the trucks parked in two fields adjacent to the headquarters. The trucks were jacked up and the tires removed.

#### TOOLS LYING IDLE

In storehouses at Hyner, Clinton County; North Bend, Clinton County, and Waterville, Lycoming County, are:

Seven hundred and eighty-five steel wheelbarrows.

Five thousand heavy sledges and hammers.

Six hundred and fifty heavy crowbars.

Seven hundred and fifty picks.

Four hundred mattocks.

Innumerable other tools and fire extinguishers.

At one time there were 104 camps in Pennsylvania. They were put up by the Civilian Conservation Corps, an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. Most of them are on land supplied by the State.

At present there are only 14 camps, and of that number 8 are to go in the near future.

Some of the camps have been dismantled completely. At others the barracks and other buildings remain standing in good condition. They may be valuable for evacuation centers or concentration camps.

#### THE BOWLING PROGRAM AND PHYSICAL FITNESS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, recently the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made an attack upon Mr. John B. Kelly, of Philadelphia, United States Director of Physical Fitness, because he had adopted a bowling program as a part of his plan to furnish recreation to warplant workers and to improve the physical fitness of the American public.

I am advised that the junior Senator from Virginia telegraphed Mr. Kelly for complete information concerning this program, and that Mr. Kelly in turn furnished the Senator with information which enabled him to be familiar with just what was being done through this bowling program.

Mr. Kelly, because of the attack upon him and the program by the junior Senator from Virginia, issued a statement to the public press, as follows:

The unwarranted attack by Senator HARRY F. BYRD on the bowling program of the United States Division of Physical Fitness is a classic example of one of our national leaders boondoggling in Congress instead of focusing his attention on what is happening in the South Pacific and in Europe.

This is a perfect example of a politically inspired committee head asking for facts and then presenting them in twisted fashion for public consumption.

Mr. Jack Willem, of Chicago, was appointed bowling coordinator for the Hale America Bowling Council on February 17. He is 1 of 61 such coordinators who now make up this Division's Sports Board.

Not 1 of these 61 coordinators receive salary, per diem, or pay of any kind—not even traveling expenses. They are all patriotic-minded sports authorities who are spending their own money—not yours, mine, or the Government's—to help develop the sports portion of a program designed to get this country physically fit to win the war quickly and decisively.

Senator BYRD knows this. He wired for the facts last Saturday. I wired back to him the information that Mr. Willem was not being paid and never had been paid. Apparently the Senator sent one telegram seeking information but ignored the reply because it did not suit his purposes.

There were 16,000,000 bowlers in the United States when this Division was established by



Executive order of the President. Since then the number has been increased to nearly 20,000,000. Statistics show that bowling is one of the games most desirable from a point of recreation and relaxation among the personnel in war-production plants.

And this personnel is vitally important for the welfare of the country's war effort because it still takes 18 men and women behind the line to keep 1 man on the battle front supplied with tools and equipment, without which we cannot hope for victory. Or doesn't Senator BYRD know that?

The desire for bowling by workers in war-production industries is best illustrated by what happened in Chicago 2 months ago. City authorities decided bowling establishments should be closed at 10 o'clock each night. There was a great uproar from war-production-plant workers, who are kept busy turning out emergency equipment until midnight or later 7 days a week. These workers charged they were being deprived of their one desired and practical means of recreation. Mayor Edward Kelly agreed with them and announced he was in favor of keeping Chicago's bowling alleys open 24 hours daily.

All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy. If we do not provide recreation for war-production personnel, how can we expect to keep our men and machines—on both the home and the firing fronts—operating at peak efficiency? What is Senator BYRD's solution?

On February 6, 1942, in the office of the United States Division of Physical Fitness, the representatives of America's 16,000,000 bowlers convened for a round-table discussion. Some 25 men and women came to Philadelphia, at their own expense, from every section of the Nation to form a Hale America Bowling Council. The purpose of this council was to enlist every bowling facility, and every bowler, in a program designed to make all Americans physically fit by providing necessary recreation.

Attending this conference were the delegates of the American Bowling Congress, the Women's International Bowling Congress, the National Duck Pin Congress, the Rubber Bank Duck Pin Congress, the Candle Pin Association, the American High School Bowling Congress, the Bowling Proprietors Association, and the Bowling Manufacturers Association.

This was the first time all of these groups had been represented at any round-table discussion. They came to Philadelphia because they all had the same thing in mind—how could they best serve America's war effort? Why, the American Bowling Congress alone had subscribed over \$10,000,000 to the Defense bond campaign. These people were here because they wanted to do their part.

Right after this meeting Mr. Willem was chosen coordinator for the Hale America Bowling Council. He was picked because of his experience in the bowling extension field.

Mr. Willem accepted the assignment and went to work, at his own expense, to utilize the services of America's bowlers and all bowling facilities in whatever way they would best serve America's all-out war effort.

To date his activities have cost the people of the United States less money than the telegram Senator BYRD sent to me or the one which I sent to him and he apparently chose to ignore.

#### SPEEDING UP OF WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for over 2 years I have been urging that we place all war industries on a 24-hour, 7-day basis.

Nearly a year ago from this floor I advocated relaxing the 40-hour week in order that we might increase production. Until recently I felt like a voice crying in the wilderness.

But today, thanks to Donald Nelson and News Analyst Kaltenborn, a prairie

fire of public opinion has started which will not be quenched until we have reached the peak of our production.

Thank God our people are today demanding that every hindrance, no matter how small, be swept out of the way. They are demanding that no strike or lock-out, no matter how insignificant, be tolerated. They are demanding that profiteering and racketeering in industry be eliminated.

Mr. President, the British boys at Dunkerque had to fight without weapons. For 4½ years the Chinese have fought almost with their bare hands.

In almost every engagement where the Allied forces have lost it has been because the enemy had a superiority of heavy weapons. Today our own boys are going into battle. They must have weapons. Every other cause and every other problem must take second place today. American production must be increased. It will be increased.

Mr. President, I feel sure now that we shall get action, and may I say also that I expect speed as well. At this hour, when our whole world may fall for the want of weapons, we must suspend all regulations that hinder our purpose.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the War Production Board, Donald Nelson, said in a radio speech yesterday:

If all our equipment now involved in war production were used 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, we would practically double the man-hours being put into military production.

And then he went ahead to explain how the unused plant and tool capacity can be put to work.

Then later he listed the problems involved in increasing this production. I quote two of them.

First:

A reluctance to increase the number of shifts.

And second:

There are questions of time and a half and double time for holidays and Sundays.

These two hindrances to production, it seems to me, can be removed by proper legislation. Therefore, I have addressed a letter to Mr. Donald Nelson asking him to recommend legislation that will, in his opinion, be helpful to him in speeding up production.

It is not my intention to permanently destroy any of the gains which labor has made in the past years, because I worked too hard to help bring about those gains, but it is my purpose to suspend any law or regulation that is hindering production and to help pass any legislation that will be helpful in speeding production.

If Mr. Nelson answers my request by suggesting legislation which will help speed production, I shall introduce such legislation just as soon as it can be prepared.

#### PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in asking the indulgence of the Senate on this occasion, I have no desire to delay the speedy consummation of the matter now pending before the Senate. I wish to say that I am in receipt of more letters

and more complaints from my constituents dealing with the subject I now wish to discuss for a few minutes than I have received on any other question pending before Congress. I have received more letters of complaint on this particular subject than I have received complaining about strikes and congressional pensions.

Mr. President, shortly before his death last year, the late lamented and dearly beloved Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, introduced Senate bill 860 providing that in the interest of common defense no person, corporation, partnership, or association shall sell, supply, give, or have in his or its possession any alcoholic liquors, including beer, ale, or wine at or within any military camp station, fort, post, yard, base, cantonment, training, or mobilization place which is being used at the time for military purposes; and to provide for the suppression of vice in said military establishments.

Senator Sheppard, "the dean of Congress," was the distinguished chairman of the highly important Committee on Military Affairs, a recognized student of military affairs, and also an ardent exponent of prohibition. His courageous and unrelenting fight for prohibition throughout his long and honorable public career earned for him the title, "Father of Prohibition." The repeal of the eighteenth amendment was the abiding sorrow of his life, and thereafter on each anniversary of the passage of the eighteenth amendment, the Senator made a stirring speech in this Chamber condemning beverage alcohol as a threat to the health, happiness, and prosperity of our citizenship. In his address on January 16 of last year, he especially emphasized the evil of the liquor traffic in relation to national defense. He condemned it as "a charge upon the public, intolerable in an era of strenuous effort toward national security and defense." He condemned it because "an alcohol-drinking democracy cannot develop the maximum strength for national defense."

It is significant to note, however, that in drafting Senate bill 860 Senator Sheppard very prudently avoided any semblance of using it as a back-door approach to that intensely controversial subject of national prohibition. The measure is confined solely to national defense. It is strictly a war measure, relating to men in the service. In its essence the issue involved as pertaining to alcoholic beverage is whether or not alcohol shall be permitted to impair the efficiency of our armed forces for saving our country in this time of our Nation's severest crisis.

There is nothing new or bizarre about it. During World War No. 1 far more stringent steps were taken because they became necessary. Senator Sheppard knew that, because he played an important role in that wartime legislation. In the final analysis it even became necessary to pass what was called the Wartime Prohibition Act, prohibiting the manufacture of intoxicating liquor in the United States for the duration of the war. I might add that during the period of strict wartime prohibition the alco-

holic death ratio dropped to 1 per 100,000 population, compared with a ratio of 5.25 per 100,000 population for the 5 wet years, 1913 to 1917, inclusive. In other words, deaths from alcoholism decreased 80.8 percent during the wartime prohibition era. Senator Sheppard knew all that, yet he did not take advantage of current wartime conditions by trying to place in effect an all-over prohibition measure. With characteristic fairness, he took a well-warranted step in the right direction and proposed a manifestly essential measure in the best interests of the defense program. I deem it the duty of the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to Senate bill 860, which would most surely go a long way to preserve and promote the efficiency of our defenders and help us win this World War No. 2.

During the past year my mail has been heavy with appeals from good citizens in every walk of life throughout my State and throughout the whole country, urging that Congress pass proper legislation to control the liquor evil around our training centers.

Mothers of young men in the service are especially insistent that we do something about the liquor problem. I do not blame them. We have exercised our power to call their boys into service, and those mothers are looking to us to see to it that their sons are afforded every reasonable protection from evils which lurk in the shadows to ensnare young men in uniform. They are expecting us to do everything within our power to send their boys home to them after it is all over, as fine and virile and upright as when they left their homes to join the colors of their country.

Now that we are in actual combative warfare on five oceans and seven seas, involving all the islands of the seas, it is doubly essential that we resolutely and uncompromisingly tackle the liquor problem existing in and around our military posts.

Let no one misunderstand my motives or my sentiments in regard to this subject. I have every confidence in the boys in our armed services. They are the flower of American manhood. For the most part they are courageous, intelligent, ingenious, and fervently patriotic; they have character and integrity. Almost to a man they are determined to win a victory so complete that freedom will ring down through the ages with a strength that no potential dictator would dare challenge. I would be the last to suggest imposing undue restraints on their personal liberties or to advocate too much regimentation. It is because I do have at heart the personal welfare of our service men and because I so highly cherish the priceless liberties to be defended by our men, that I am so seriously concerned with the problem of safeguarding them from exploitation by the liquor traffic and its accompanying evils.

I was Governor of my State during World War No. 1, and so have first-hand knowledge of and some experience in dealing with the kind of situation now under discussion. As a Member of the United States Senate, I have been pro-

foundly interested in the affairs of the veterans of that war, helping to fight for adequate veterans' pensions, assisting veterans with compensation matters, and so on. It is heart-rending to note the number of physically and mentally disabled veterans whose conditions are attributed mainly to the effects of liquor habits and social diseases acquired while in the service. Such veterans have been denied compensation because the authorities hold that their conditions are due to their own misconduct. Fine, stalwart men they were, most of them; the pride of their mothers' hearts—but now physical and mental wrecks.

The crying need for immediately effective action to minimize the number of such cases in the current war is glaringly demonstrated in the recent statement of Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. His report showed that tens of thousands of young men in our armed services were found to have contracted social diseases during the past year.

War-time psychology is such that sometimes even the best of boys, finding themselves stationed far away from the stabilizing influences of home, perhaps away from home for the first time in life, are easy prey for that most insidious of saboteurs—John Barleycorn. It is too frequently accepted as axiomatic that the soldier or sailor or aviator is entitled to take his fun where he finds it. The spirit seems to be "Drink, for tomorrow we may die." Even among young men in civilian life drinking gets to be more prevalent in war times. With them it is, "Drink, for tomorrow we are drafted."

It is certain that the proximity of liquor dispensaries encourages the liquor habit in boys who otherwise would not be likely to cultivate the drinking habit; and it is our duty to do something about it.

It would seem to me that argument in favor of the pending measure should not be necessary. It should appeal, without question, to the intelligence and higher sentiments which actuate thinking men and women when dire and appalling crises have befallen humanity. We all know that our boys should be kept as sober, as virile, and as alert at all times as it is possible to be in these perilous times when the safety of the Nation rests on their shoulders. Any military officer worthy of the name will tell us emphatically that our service men do not need alcohol. The recent statement of Col. George Skinner, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, is so straightforward and so appropriate to the subject, that it warrants repetition here. I quote Colonel Skinner:

Today our development is so largely mechanical and our equipment moves at such speed that even the most ordinary routine of daily life requires the clearest brain and the most accurate and rapid muscular action possible. This is demonstrated daily by the number of traffic injuries, and as traffic is now mostly automobile, the injuries and deaths from this cause are appalling. A large percentage of them are the direct result of the use of alcoholic drinks. Why? We depend largely upon the quick action of the mind and the rapid response of the muscles to the needs of the body. The first action of alcohol is to break up the connection be-

tween the mind and body, to confuse the mind, and to slow muscular action. Hence, even if the mind notes that the body is in danger and orders the muscles to act, the order is badly mixed up in reaching the muscles, and the response may be directly opposite from what it should be. The worst of it is that the owner of the mind does not realize the difficulty and proceeds serenely on his destructive way until he is either killed, injured, or taken out of circulation some other way.

These reactions to alcohol operate as surely in the Army as in civil life. In our present defense needs, the protective armament is very largely mechanical and often exceedingly complicated, requiring the finest training and muscular response (coordination) possible. As a man's life—and the lives of others—in an airplane depends upon the accurate judgment and coordination of the pilot—and both judgment and coordination are badly disturbed by alcohol—it stands to reason that a man who indulges in alcohol is not going to be trusted with such an important assignment. The same is true in practically every other part of the modern army and if our country is to survive in a crisis depending upon defense, we must have trained defense forces relatively free from the disturbances of alcohol.

An air pilot who has alcoholic inclinations is not going to last long on his job, for not only is there danger to the lives of others besides himself but he is in charge of a very expensive machine which takes months to replace if damaged or destroyed, and by which the safety of our country may largely and radically be altered; and he would be removed entirely from his assignment. Not only does he not have to drink to be a soldier, but if he does drink he cannot occupy any responsible position.

Mr. President, can anyone refute the profound and unimpeachable truth of Colonel Skinner's words? Most certainly not.

No sensible person, be he saint or sinner, total abstainer or the biggest drunkard in the country, would agree to risk his life in an airplane piloted by a drunken pilot or on a train run by a drunken engineer. No successful businessman would think of hiring men who would drink on the job to operate expensive machinery, or to build it. In fact, no successful businessman or organization will permit drinking on the job. Therefore, I contend that we are not taking away personal liberties of our service men when we take steps to curb alcoholism at their posts of duty.

We are appropriating billions and billions of dollars to buy planes, tanks, ships, and guns for the defense of our country. It stands to reason that this equipment will not and cannot be any more efficient than the men who must operate it.

If there be any Senators who doubt that a country's defense is imperiled when the discipline of its defenders is relaxed, their virility and alertness impaired, and their sense of duty distorted by alcohol, let them look to the events of the past for incontrovertible proof that armies, nations, and causes have collapsed because of intemperance.

Incidentally, the American Business Men's Research Foundation has been doing some exhaustive research on the subject of war and liquor. No doubt other Senators received, as I did, a copy of the foundation's recent letter calling attention to historic cases of liquor mixed



up with war. The gentlemen who constitute the foundation deserve our commendation for their gallant efforts. They have concluded and unequivocally declared:

Liquor has defeated more men, more armies, more nations than any other cause. It does seem that the lessons that history records should serve as an ample warning against this greatest of all enemies.

Mr. President, that statement, viewed lightly, may seem to be an exaggeration; the indictment too severe. Viewed maturely, in the strong light of historic fact, it is, indeed, convincing.

I submit that history, both sacred and profane, furnishes abundant evidence that time and time again alcohol has been a contributing factor, if not the prime factor, in the defeat of armies on the battlefield and of nations in conflict with other peoples.

Holy Writ records—and surely no stable mind can doubt the Holy Word—that Babylon, that celebrated city of antiquity, brought about its own ruin through drunkenness and dissipation.

It was when Belshazzar sat drinking wine out of the sacred vessels in his Babylonian palace, with his lords and multiple wives and other "ladies" of the court, that the writing came upon the wall in blazing letters, "Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." It is thought that this particular night of revelry had been planned for the rulers and captains who had retreated before the advancing armies of Cyrus into the stronghold of Babylon. Doubtless the carousal was a desperate effort to draw the minds of all from the dangers that surrounded them. Be that as it may, there was much drinking, not only in the palace but throughout the great city. Wine flowed freely, and spirits were gay and abandoned. Belshazzar and his people felt secure within the vast stone walls with heavy gates of brass. But out in the country a few sturdy and diligent mountaineers had been digging ditches for some time, unnoticed. Nobody had taken much account of the humble ditch diggers; yet even that night, in the very midst of Belshazzar's wine-drenched revelry the veteran troops of Cyrus were marching silently and steadfastly under the walls, down the bed of the lowered Euphrates, and the very pathway of Babylon's wealth and grandeur became the pathway of her ruin.

In that night was Belshazzar, the King of the Chaldeans, slain. And Darius, the Median, took the kingdom, being about three-score and 2 years old.

Holy Writ records that Nineveh, another proud city of antiquity, was destroyed by the Medes when the enemy came upon it in a night of sensual drinking and feasting. Nineveh, like Babylon, drank her hemlock of dissipation and was absorbed by the sands of the desert.

Holy Writ records that David defeated the Amalekites after they were found drunk celebrating a temporary victory.

Holy Writ records that Ahab surprised and defeated Benhadad, King of Syria, when he found him with 32 kings, "drinking themselves drunk in their pavilions."

In the realm of profane history let us take as one example Alexander the Great.

He experienced triumph after triumph and longed for new worlds to conquer. His remarkable conquests, the charm of his dynamic personality, and the fervor of his spirit stirred the imagination of the whole world. Wherever he went he became a legendary figure. He was even acclaimed by some as the son of Zeus. Throughout the period of his phenomenal victories he was noted for his sobriety. Perhaps excessive adulation turned his head; perhaps it was due to boredom while waiting for new worlds to conquer, or a combination of both—we know not—but the inference is clear that he fell into the habit of imbibing. According to the immortal Greek biographer, Plutarch, the death of Alexander the Great was precipitated by a drunken carousal.

There—

According to Plutarch—

he drank all the night and the next day, until at last he found a fever coming upon him.

Alexander the Great, the invincible conqueror, himself was conquered by alcohol at the early age of 33.

The Romans in the earlier years of their civilization were strictly sober but eventually undermined and sacrificed their great civilization through a period of three centuries of dissipation.

The Normans won the Battle of Hastings on September 28, 1066, during which, as told by the historian William of Malmesbury, "they passed the night in fasting and prayer," while "the Anglo-Saxon devoted the same period to drunkenness and debauch." In the battle that took place the next day, Harold and his drinking Saxons were routed, and William won the throne of England.

On Christmas Eve, 1776, the American troops crossed the Delaware and won the Battle of Trenton when they surprised the Hessian soldiers celebrating the season with drinking and feasting.

In the War of 1812, the U. S. S. *Argus* fell an easy prey to the British brig because the night before the battle the American sailors had been allowed to drink so much wine that few of their shots hit the British vessel.

Napoleon met his Waterloo when a tyrant as ruthless as himself crept into his army, for, as someone has aptly expressed it:

Since the creation of the world there has been no tyrant like intemperance and no slaves so cruelly treated as his.

Everyone familiar with the story of the Battle of Waterloo knows that poor discipline was largely responsible for the defeat of Napoleon's armies. Authentic historical records now disclose that Marshal Ney retired to his headquarters on the eve of the fateful battle and—

Fell into a deep and prolonged sleep after imbibing his favorite Burgundy too freely, and when he awoke he found himself apparently unable to give orders or to reach any decision.

During World War No. 1, when the German forces were advancing on Paris, the spearhead of the advance suddenly broke. No one could tell why. It was later revealed by Prof. Hans Schmidt, a commanding officer on the west front, that—

The French had left a great supply of alcoholic drink as the surest means of retarding the German advance. Two whole divisions were found drunk ready to be cut down by the Allied troops; the wine-drenched Germans were simply mowed down by the enemy machine guns.

It is said that the Crown Prince, acknowledging receipt of Professor Schmidt's report, remarked:

If we had not found alcohol, we should have advanced further than the March offensive. You are right in laying your finger on this painful wound.

According to press dispatches from Vichy following the collapse of France in World War No. 2, certain French Government spokesmen named alcohol as the chief cause of the moral collapse of the French Army under the German attack. It was stated that drunkenness had been rampant in the Army during the 8 months of inactivity at the start of the war; that a single hospital in the Fourth Army Area had 814 cases of delirium tremens during a single month; and that the "disastrous era of intoxication" among young French soldiers had caused most of the cases of nervous break-down and shell shock when they had to face the German dive bombers and tanks.

Hitler's armed forces have been strictly disciplined in every respect, and particularly against the use of alcohol. The German people are great beer drinkers, to be sure; but immoderate use of beer or any other alcoholic beverage is "verboten" for men in the service. One Dr. Matthaei, formerly staff physician in the German Army, went on record as saying:

We should not discuss moderation with a man. The thing has long since been settled by science. The use of narcotic poisons is simply indecent and criminal.

Some persons hold that there is a wide difference between alcohol and narcotics. But Dr. Haven Emerson places alcohol and narcotics in the same category. He served as a colonel in the Medical Corps of the United States Army during the first World War. He was decorated by France and by the United States for his distinguished service. Dr. Emerson's opinion of alcohol is, in part:

Alcohol is a depressant habit-forming narcotic drug. Alcohol is a protoplasmic poison. Alcohol is drunk to get the drug effect and whenever it is so taken in whatever amount it exerts to some degree its depressant and toxic effects.

As I have just said, Hitler's men have been rigidly trained to conserve every resource, every ounce of energy, every atom of brain power, and every scintilla of ingenuity for application to the unholy cause for which they are fighting. Of late, however, occasional lapses have been noted. In their desperation, in their fanatical determination to subdue the Russians, they have been resorting to the false and temporary stimuli of alcoholic beverages. Back in November, in order to make progress toward the capture of Moscow in the face of the terrific winter storms that assailed them, the German troops were found in many cases to have been doped with alcohol in

the hope of gaining temporary courage, energy, and warmth to overcome the obstacles that lay before them. The results that followed must have been very disappointing to the Germans, for they sustained a disastrous series of defeats along a large part of the fighting lines.

On January 31, news reports came from London to the effect that the German troops on the Moscow front had resorted to suicide attacks such as they used when the tide turned against them at Leningrad, in desperate attempts to halt the Russian drive. According to the communique, German shock troops marched in close order to counterattack a village held by a Russian tank unit. The soldiers had been given intoxicants before the attack. The Russians described the Germans as marching up like automatons. The tank men held their fire until the Germans were at close range and then blasted them with every gun they had. Scores of Germans fell at the first volley and the German formation broke and fled.

The title of that news item was "Nazi Suicide Troops Given Rum Courage." The finale was another defeat for the drinking German troops. The moral is: Rum courage cannot win battles.

At this juncture I am forcefully reminded of the interchange between Robert Ingersoll, the prominent atheist of his time, and Dr. James Buckley, an eminent physician of that period. Ingersoll sent the good doctor a package, and with it this letter:

DEAR BUCKLEY: I send you some of the most wonderful whiskey that ever drove the skeleton from the feast or painted landscapes in the brain of man. It is the mingled soul of wheat and corn. In it you will find the sunshine and shadow that chased each other over billowy fields, the breath of June, the carol of the lark, the dew of the night, the wealth of summer and autumn, rich content, all golden with imprisoned light. Drink it and you will hear the voices of men and maidens sing in the harvest home, mingled with the laughter of children. Drink it and you will feel within your blood the starred dawns, the dreamy, tawny dusks of perfect days. For 40 years this liquid joy has been confined within staves of oak, longing to touch the lips of man.

The letter was signed, "Your friend, Robert G. Ingersoll."

Dr. Buckley acknowledged his friend's offering, as follows:

MY DEAR BOB: I return to you some of the most wonderful whisky that ever brought a skeleton into the closet or painted scenes of lust and bloodshed in the brain of man. It is the ghost of wheat and corn, crazed by the loss of their natural bodies. In it you will find a transient sunshine chased by a shadow as cold as an Arctic midnight, in which the breath of June grows icy and the carol of the lark gives place to the foreboding cry of the raven. Drink it and "you will have woe, sorrow, babbling, and wounds without cause." Your eyes shall behold strange women and your heart shall utter perverse things. Drink it deep and you shall hear the voices of demons shrieking, women wailing, and then, all orphaned, children mourning the loss of a father who yet lives. Drink it deep and long serpents will hiss in your ears, coil themselves about your neck, and seize you with their fangs. "At last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." For 40 years this liquid death has been confined within staves of oak, harmless there as pure water.

I send it to you that you may put an enemy in your mouth to steal your brains; and yet, I call myself your friend.

BUCKLEY.

Dr. Buckley's words came vividly to my mind as I read some days ago an Associated Press story emanating from one of our military camps in California. It carried the headline, "Soldier gets 10 years as drinking-bout slayer." It briefly stated that a master sergeant—I shall omit names—was sentenced to 10 years in prison by a court martial which convicted him of manslaughter in the shooting of another sergeant during a drinking bout on December 17. I know nothing of the events that led up to this tragic occurrence. I can only presume it to have been just one of those inexplicable incidents that can arise from a drinking bout—whether among soldiers or civilians. The chances are that those two soldiers had been good buddies, the best of friends. But now one is dead, and the other is in prison for the slaying of a fellow soldier, all because of the iniquitous effects of alcohol. I have no doubt that both were fine young men. But when the "long serpents" of "liquid death" are hissing in the ears, the voice of human compassion, of reason, and of conscience is stilled.

We had a very tragic example of this kind right here in the shadow of the Capitol the other day. Everybody who reads the papers knows about it. A 20-year-old Bolling Field soldier shot and killed a cab driver at Eleventh and East Capitol Streets. The only explanation this poor youngster has been able to give is:

As much as I can tell you is, I never saw the man before in my life. I was drunk at the time and didn't know what I was doing. I never saw the man before. I never before killed a man in my life. That's all I have to say.

According to the police, the young soldier had been drinking and got a ride into town in an Army car. He had with him a gun which he had "borrowed" from the holster of another soldier. Near the Capitol he hailed a taxi, and rode around town for a short time; then the soldier pulled out the gun and began brandishing it. The cab driver halted the car and started to flee, only to be shot in the back and killed by the soldier boy—for no reason at all. The youngster was drunk, and did not know what he was doing, or why.

This is but another sad commentary on our lack of proper control over the liquor evil in and around our training camps. It is a shameful reflection on our Government. It points an accusing finger at Congress for not enacting proper control legislation.

And yet in the face of all the damaging evidence against alcohol the opponents of Senate bill 860 are advancing all sorts of specious arguments against controlling liquor traffic in our military establishments. In an effort to strengthen their feeble arguments, they sometimes point to great men of history as examples of heavy drinkers who achieved greatness. They claim that those men did their best work and reached their highest pinnacles of success while "under the influence."

They mention such men as General Grant, Shakespeare, Daniel Webster, and Robert Ingersoll.

It is true that shortly after the close of the Mexican War, General Grant was kicked out of the Army because of his intemperance. In fact, he had a most difficult time getting back in. Except for the pressing need for trained officers during the Civil War, he would have remained in disgrace and obscurity. He was in constant peril of being thrown out again because of his occasional lapses back into his solitary drinking habits. His men had to rally to his defense on more than one occasion and testify to his sobriety in order to save him from dismissal. The memoirs of his fellow officers in the Civil War show that General Grant did his drinking between times, while celebrating a victory, or when things were dull; never while mapping important plans of strategy.

He well knew that alcohol was the enemy of military efficiency, for when he joined the Sons of Temperance and took the pledge of sobriety a few days after his marriage to Julia Dent, he went on record as saying:

There is no safety from ruin by liquor except by abstaining from it altogether.

He was very careful to appoint officers to serve with him who were abstemious—for instance, John Rawlins, who was appointed as an adjutant as soon as Grant received his commission as brigadier general. Rawlins is described by historians as "a teetotaler who was punctual, precise, and abstemious to the verge of fanaticism." This young officer was constantly at the general's elbow and wielded a great influence over him. Gen. James H. Wilson said—and I quote:

It was Rawlins more than any other man who aroused Grant's sensibilities and gave his actions that prompt, aggressive, and unrelenting character which so distinguished them. In fact, it has been frequently and truthfully said that the two together constituted a military character of great simplicity, force, and singleness of purpose, which has passed into history under the name of Grant.

There is nothing in the factual records to indicate that General Grant ever approached any very important undertaking while under the influence of liquor. On the other hand, his strategies all were planned deliberately, soberly, and with the counsel of trusted fellow officers who were notably sober.

Now let us see about Shakespeare. It may be true, as some claim, that Shakespeare's death came as a result of a drunken debauch at the home of his affinity, on his way from London to his home in Stratford. But it must be remembered that the great Shakespeare had quit writing 3 years before his death, had entirely deserted his "brain children." There is nothing in the records to prove that he imbibed to any considerable degree during his productive years. He was a good businessman as well as a brilliant poet and dramatist. He did his work systematically and amassed a sizable fortune. Toward the end of his writing career, when evidences of liquor showed up in his work, he grew careless and—



left to lesser hands the lagging later scenes of Cymbeline, parts of Henry VII, and very much of Pericles.

The inferior quality of those productions, as compared with the literary glories of Hamlet, Lear, Macbeth, and so forth, serve conclusively to void the argument that Shakespeare did his best work while under the influence of alcohol.

As for Daniel Webster and his famous speech at Bunker Hill, it is true that he was so inebriated that he had to be helped off the train when he arrived to deliver his address. But all the evidence points to the fact that his address was prepared beforehand with painstaking care and in an atmosphere of absolute sobriety, so that the profound sentiments and beautiful language that went into the speech were the products of a strictly sober mind.

As for Robert Ingersoll and his eloquence and his liquor, it is true that he was an able orator and a confirmed drinker. But he was principally noted for his declarations of atheism. He gained some prominence in politics, but his distorted concepts of life ruined him. We may well assume that his addiction to drink went a long way to warp his mind and soul. Certainly no thinking man or woman could seriously regard Ingersoll as an exemplar of true greatness when it is realized that his drunken eloquence won for him only the undesirable distinction of being "a brilliant but dangerous iconoclast."

Let the wets reflect upon what some of our greatest Presidents had to say about liquor.

George Washington, the father of our country, only a few days before his induction into office as President of our Nation condemned drink as "the source of all evil and the ruin of half the working men in the country."

John Adams, the second President, classed the liquor traffic as "an arch corrupter of politics."

Thomas Jefferson, the third President, and author of the Declaration of Independence, was outspoken in his condemnation of liquor. Here is what he said:

The habit of using ardent spirits by men in public office has produced more injury to the public service and more trouble to me than any other circumstance that has occurred in the internal concerns of the country during my administration.

In fact, a few months after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the First Continental Congress passed a resolution, which read as follows:

That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived, if not quickly prevented.

Abraham Lincoln, in a speech on Washington's Birthday, in 1842, made a strong appeal for prohibition:

In it we shall find a stronger bondage broken, a viler slavery manumitted, a greater tyrant deposed; in it, more of want supplied, more of disease healed, more of sorrow assuaged. By it, no orphans starving, no widows weeping. By it, none wounded in feeling, none injured in interest. \* \* \*

If the relative grandeur of revolutions shall be estimated by the great amount of human misery they alleviate and the small amount they inflict, then, indeed, will this be the grandest the world shall ever have seen. \* \* \*

And when victory shall be complete—when there shall be neither a slave nor a drunkard on the earth—how proud the title of that land which may truly claim to be the birthplace of both these revolutions that shall have ended in that victory. How nobly distinguished that people who shall have planted and nurtured to maturity both the political and moral freedom of their species.

We could go on and on, quoting utterances of the world's greatest patriots in condemnation of the liquor evil. On and on, down through the corridors of time, ring the echoes of voices, long since silenced, in eloquent testimony to the fact that alcohol has been a most dangerous fifth columnist, a most vicious saboteur of human welfare, since time immemorial.

Now we are spending large sums of money to curb sabotage, espionage, and fifth-column activities in our present war effort. Yet there are some who would prevent passage of the proposed measure to rout from our training centers the master ally of all the saboteurs and spies and fifth columnists—John Barleycorn.

If there be any who doubt that alcohol and narcotics are playing a fifth-column role in the current war, let them ask our Allies who have been in the war longer than we have. Let them ask China. Opium is to the Chinese what liquor is to the American, you know. Chinese leaders tell us that the Japanese have used opium as a major weapon in this war. Dr. Victor Hoo Chi-Tsai, an eminent Chinese physician, is quoted as having said:

Japan has invaded China not only with men and guns but with narcotics. Manchuria, Japan's puppet state, has become a narcotic arsenal. Japanese consulates in China are distributing centers for opium.

He said that Japanese fifth columnists are dispensing opium freely among millions of Chinese peasants in conquered territories in order to keep them from helping their fellow countrymen in the awful conflict.

Hon. Harry J. Anslinger, United States Commissioner of Narcotics, in a recent report, disclosed that many attempts had been made by the Nipponese to poison the blood of the American people with dangerous drugs. He said that Japanese officials had three objectives in their drug traffic—to gain revenue, to corrupt western nations, and to weaken or enslave the peoples of lands invaded or marked for invasion by Japan.

He stated further that wherever the Japanese Army goes the drug traffic follows; that in every territory conquered by the Japanese a large part of the people become enslaved with drugs, because the Japanese are master technicians at poisoning with drugs. Just as the Japanese are master technicians at poisoning with drugs, so, too, are the liquor traffickers master technicians at poisoning with alcohol.

No, Mr. President, I cannot reconcile the views of the opponents of Senate bill 860 with any reasonable attitude looking to the welfare of our men in the armed forces. Even if we would or could

ignore the physical and mental welfare of these young men, even if we would or could ignore the constant anxiety of the mothers and wives of these boys who are risking their lives for the salvation of our country, even if we would or could ignore all the moral principles involved, we still would be duty bound to see to it that the liquor traffic and its accompanying evils shall not sabotage the manpower of our armed forces.

"Make America strong" is the slogan we hear on every hand. All Americans are being urged to make every possible sacrifice in order to win this far-flung war. We are spending gigantic sums of money to make America strong. We are determined to give our fighting men the very best of everything to be used in winning this war. We know that the efficient handling of this expensive armament depends upon the virility and alertness and precision and judgment of the men who operate the ships and planes and tanks and guns. Then we should be very short-sighted indeed should we fail to take immediate and effective steps to safeguard our men and our equipment against the destructive forces of the liquor traffic and its accompanying evils. We just cannot afford to let John Barleycorn wage an alcoholic warfare to the advantage of the Axis murderers.

The perennial "wets" may talk and theorize as much as they please, but they know in their hearts that the whole story of civilization speaks this eternal truth with clarion voice: It is when Samson lies in the lap of Delilah, or reclines in the arms of the goddess of wine—it is then that the enemy sneaks in and ensnares and subdues him.

In the interest of effectual national defense and ultimate victory, in the interest of the physical and mental welfare of our defenders, for the sake of anxious mothers and wives, and in the hallowed memory of our late lamented colleague Senator Morris Sheppard, I do most earnestly implore the Senate to pass Senate bill 860 without further delay.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SMITH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Rosier
Bilbo	Herring	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brown	Hughes	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Mead	Vandenberg
Danaher	Millikin	Van Nuys
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Doxey	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREEN in the chair). Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH obtained the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

# PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND VICE NEAR MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has just delivered a very able address in favor of the enactment of Senate bill 860. In view of the remarks he has made, I should like to call attention to the fact that on January 16 I made an unsuccessful effort to bring that bill before the Senate for consideration. At that time I made the following statement, which appears on page 423 of the RECORD:

Very well. Since the Senator mentioned that the Secretary of War had objected to this bill, I merely wanted to call attention to the fact that his objection was filed a long time before we got into war. I wish also to call attention to the fact that this bill would not, in any way, shape, manner, or form, put the men in the armed forces, the men in uniform, in a different category from civilians. It would not prohibit a man in the service from buying liquor and drinking liquor wherever it is legally for sale, and drinking it there. It would prevent civilians from going into military camps and buying liquor just as it would prevent men in uniforms, members of the armed forces, from buying liquor in the same place. It would simply remove liquor from the workshop of the American Army, Navy, and air force.

After I made these remarks on the floor of the Senate on January 16, the Committee on Military Affairs sent me a copy of a letter which they had received from the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, dated January 22, addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the committee. In the letter the Secretary stated:

It has been brought to my attention that during the debate in the Senate, January 16, 1942, on the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 860, a bill relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of the land and naval forces and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military and naval camps and establishments, it was argued that my opposition to the enactment of that measure was expressed "a long time before we got into war." Let that statement should influence anyone's attitude toward the legislation, I wish to state to you and to the members of your committee that the views I expressed in my letter of May 2, 1941, remain unchanged.

I trust that no further action will be taken by the Senate on the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,  
Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I merely wish to keep the record straight, and that is my purpose in reading this letter into the RECORD, so that Senators may know that until January 22 the wish of the Secretary of War was that the Senate should take no further action on Senate bill 860.

In that connection I wish to congratulate the Secretary of War for his wisdom and strategy in making this statement. There will come a day of reckoning with

reference to everything that is being done in connection with the conduct of the war, and the responsibility will be placed, no doubt, where it belongs, and the blame will be placed where it should be placed. At the present time the responsibility for the conditions with which Senate bill 860 deals is not on the shoulders of the Secretary of War.

As I understand, the responsibility is wholly on the Congress of the United States. Therefore if the Secretary of War, in his wisdom and by his strategy, can bluff the Congress into not placing the responsibility on him, no doubt he will have freed himself of a great responsibility. I merely wish to call this to the attention of Senators in order that we may realize that it is not necessary for the Congress to comply with the wish of the Secretary of War, that if we desire we can shift the responsibility from our shoulders to those of the Secretary of War, and then he will be able to handle the problem in any way he desires. If he is in favor of the way in which it is now being handled, he may continue with the same system. If he desires it changed, he can change it. It would merely place the responsibility on him, where the responsibility rightfully belongs, inasmuch as he is the Secretary of War.

I have received thousands of letters from folks who are interested and alarmed about conditions existing around some of the camps. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all the letters, but I have one in particular which has just been received, which I should like to read into the RECORD. It comes from W. L. Hall, route 1, James, Tex., and reads:

Mr. W. LEE O'DANIEL.

DEAR SIR: I have heard you so much on my radio it seems as I ought to know you.

And I do know from your words you love God and His cause.

So I am writing you these few lines that you may let me know what I can do.

I have 10 children. My oldest child is 23. He was called to the Army; left Gilmer yesterday, the 26th. It was awful to see my boy, your boy, or anybody's boy leave with such as he had to leave with, as a number of them had their liquor and was drinking heavy.

Now, I have tried to raise my boys right, and I had rather see him go to his grave than to go in such company; such strong temptation.

I see many weeping with tears, seeing our boys going into the camp, and so much evil in our country and in our camps, for it is hard to get along with one drunkard much less 100 hundred or more. Now, if we can clean up our country of this liquor, I feel that the Japs will not last long, for if God is with us who can be against us?

What a pleasure it would be to go and fight for our country and for our freedom if we had a clean country to fight for. So I am asking to please write me a few lines and let me know what I can do to help clean our country from liquor.

Yours with best wishes.

W. L. HALL,  
James, Tex.

I should also like to include the following letter from a soldier's mother, Mrs. I. R. Hanks, of route 5, box 178, Wichita Falls, Tex.:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., February 9, 1942.

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I am writing you of a matter that is very near my heart, and,

knowing you as a sincere Christian, believe you can help us some way or other.

As you know, there were a lot of package stores here before Sheppard Field was built here, and now that the field is full of fine young men, like my soldier boy and yours, the whisky and beer is flowing on all sides, so to speak, and more places are being opened all the time by money-greedy men who don't care what becomes of our boys.

Saturday night, after their last pay day at Sheppard Field, our streets were lined with drunken soldier boys who had been robbed of their money and their manhood, too.

I've read that France fell from such doings as this, and America could do likewise if something isn't done quickly.

We fear fifth columnists and saboteurs; well, that's what these package stores are to our fine Army and in the very heart of our fair land.

You are our Governor no longer, but we still believe you can help us in our troubles in Texas. Texas misses you, but may God bless and use you there.

A SOLDIER'S MOTHER,  
Mrs. I. R. HANKS.

Mr. President, I also wish to place in the RECORD at this time a list of petitions from thousands of good citizens of this Nation urging the enactment of Senate bill 860.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Petitions with signatures, by cities

Johnstown, N. Y.	53
Hartwick, N. Y.	23
Yates-Ontario, N. Y.	31
Middlesex, N. Y.	35
Syracuse, N. Y.	17
Westville, N. Y.	20
Buffalo, N. Y.	6
Broome County, N. Y.	57
Hornell, N. Y.	22
Cleona-Lebanon, Pa.	47
Harrisburg, Pa.	253
Joliet, Ill.	16
State of Ohio	406
Mount Pleasant, Mich.	16
Cumberland County, N. J.	44
Marshfield, Oreg.	19
Honolulu, T. H.	91
Venice, Calif.	17
San Jacinto, Calif.	17
Fall Brook, Calif.	18
San Diego, Calif.	18
Puente, Calif.	17
Santa Clara, Calif.	74
Los Angeles, Calif.	370
LaVerne, Calif.	15
Tulare, Calif.	36
Portersville, Calif.	95
Miscellaneous petitions	14

Total..... 1,847

## Letters and petitions, with signatures, by States

California	3,142
Washington	2,315
Ohio	175
New York	380
West Virginia	96
Virginia	10
Kentucky	70
Kansas	70
Connecticut	746
Pennsylvania	111
Oregon	480
Wisconsin	17
Maryland	280
Iowa	480
Nebraska	604

Total..... 8,976

Grand total..... 10,823

Mr. O'DANIEL. I also ask to place in the RECORD at this point a news article



regarding the deplorable conditions which exist at one point in particular close to one of our Army reservations; a news article regarding a drunken soldier boy killing of a cab driver here in Washington; and an editorial appearing in Progress of February 1942.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Sun of February 20, 1942]

**THE UNITED STATES AT WAR—WAY DOWN SOUTH, AND WIDE OPEN—SOLDIERS READY, STEADY CUSTOMERS AT GAMING TABLES OF DIXIELAND**

(By Ward Morehouse)

PHENIX CITY, ALA., February 20.—Dixie has gone Monte Carlo, and in a big way. To such an extent that it makes the he-man and supposedly roistering great Southwest seem mild and placid indeed. Villages, towns, and cities, particularly those spots with military reservations nearby, have really cut loose, and there are few restraints.

Gambling establishments, many that are wide open and some that are under cover to a degree, are running full swing. They count on, and they get terrific soldier trade. Bars have multiplied in sections that are legally and theoretically dry.

It's all here, 'way down South in the land of cotton. Here, in the regions of the Suwannee, the Sabine, and the Chattahoochee the bars and the gaming tables find the uniformed man a sure and steady customer. He is offered all the after-dark diversion that he wants, can take, and pay for.

"Mister," said the Columbus (Ga.) cab driver who picked me up at the Hotel Ralston (which won't handle liquor), "I worked for 1 whole year in Chicago, but I never saw things like you can see on the other side of the river," meaning Alabama.

**CONSIDER PHENIX CITY**

Dice, roulette, blackjack, and slot machines by the thousand. Bars, bands, and dance floors. "Hostesses" on the prowl. Soldiers surging into the taverns and the dice parlors long after midnight. I saw an Infantry lieutenant win \$100 at roulette in 5 minutes on an original investment of \$5, and a private lose his \$21 at dice quicker than it took the table operator, in his melancholy chant, to say "New gunner—coming out!"

These conditions, certainly not unexpected, now exist in this teeming Southland of the tall pines, the tented cities, and the training troops in untold numbers. They exist, certainly, in Louisiana, in Alabama, in Florida, in Georgia, and probably in Mississippi.

Now, consider Phenix City. See it under impartial daylight and it seems a humdrum, uneventful Alabama town, linked with Georgia and Columbus by the bridge over the Chattahoochee. Some nice homes in Phenix City and many shabby ones. Some pretty streets, stores, clubs, churches, and a town in the foothills of the Appalachians that goes in for the manufacture of pottery, woodwork, brick, and tile. Breastworks of the Confederates are still visible. In brief, a town of around 17,000 souls not unlike, by daylight, numerous others in the Southeastern States.

**THE LIEUTENANT'S \$135**

But Phenix City after dark, particularly after midnight, is something else. The home folks have gone to bed and the soldiers take over. Uniformed men—privates, corporals, sergeants, lieutenants, and a captain here and there—swarm across the Chattahoochee and they bring cash. Phenix City jangles. It takes on the look of Las Vegas, Nev., with more soldiers around than Las Vegas ever saw. It becomes, around 1 a. m., something

of a composite of Las Vegas, Reno, Lordsburg (N. Mex.), Yuma, and the Caliente that used to be.

In one Phenix City bar, in the heart of the town and a drive of 3 minutes from the center of Columbus, there were at least 200 soldiers at 1 a. m.; probably 100 at another; and a like number at a third. Some were going along with beer, others with harder stuff; others were engaged with roulette, blackjack, dice.

The Club —, only a block or so from the bridge, is the best in Phenix City. There were only about 50 uniformed customers present, but the proprietor, or one of the proprietors, explained that it was a little early and that it looked like a quiet night. Officers outnumbered privates, corporals, and sergeants. Five lieutenants were engaged at the dice table. One of the five was from Atlanta, another from Brookline, Mass. The Atlantan lost; the boy from Brookline with the one silver bar did all right.

After a 2-hour session he turned in his red chips for an exchange of \$135 in soiled, crumpled currency. Then he tossed off the drink which had been served at the gaming table by a colored boy with a tray, stuffed the wad of bills into a pocket, turned to his less fortunate military companion and said, "Come on, Oklahoma. Now let's do the town. I hear they got everything here except bullfights."

**DIXIE, THE UNRESTRAINED**

Gambling unrestrained and prostitution uncontrolled—there's no denying that both are in evidence in this soldiered Dixieland of wartimes. "The city will notify us in plenty of time if we've got to shut down," said a head man at one of the establishments of Phenix City. "What do you expect?" said the lady fortune teller, who gets \$1 for the job. "It's always been like this where there's an army and it always will be." "Forty thousand men," mused the hotel man in Columbus. "Forty thousand men. That's a lot of money and a lot of men and the South is getting it while it can. Sure, the South now has more slot machines and more dice tables and more loose women and more bars around because it has more soldiers."

In Phenix City, the weekly—the Herald—published every Friday and billed as "the most thoroughly read newspaper in Russell County," is edited by Harold E. Poor, who hails from New Hampshire. He made no attempt to enter a denial for his town as I talked with him. But it is apparent that he is disturbed by the extent to which Phenix City has gone in extending the selectees Chattahoochee hospitality.

"I came here several years ago," said this New Englander, "and I didn't come to overhaul the town. I came to publish my small newspaper. I understand that there are things here in Phenix City that people like me can't understand, but before you write anything I wish you'd look around the South and see if things are not as bad or worse elsewhere."

I've looked and hereby report that there are spots in the South of wartimes that would undoubtedly make the mining camp of bygone days seem like a garden party. Dixieland is wide, wide open. And so certainly is Phenix City. In Louisiana, in Alabama, in Florida, and in Georgia the selectee is offered the diversions of Virginia City, Nev., of a distant day. By day he trains for war; by night, in this Chattahoochee country, he can name his entertainment and get it—if he has the price.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 26, 1942]

**SOLDIER BLAMES SLAYING ON DRINK—RATHBUN ORDERED HELD TO GRAND JURY**

"I was drunk and didn't know what I was doing," Pvt. John Rathbun, 20-year-old sol-

dier stationed at Bolling Field, told a coroner's jury yesterday in explanation of his confessed slaying of a cab driver Monday at Eleventh and East Capitol Streets.

The jury, after hearing the soldier voluntarily testify at the inquest into the death of Conrad Steele, 36, the cabbie, ordered him held for action of the grand jury. Told by Coroner A. Magruder MacDonald that he did not have to take the stand, the soldier said he wanted to say something anyway, and, in a voice almost inaudible, told the jury:

"I had never seen the man before. I was drunk at the time and didn't know what I was doing. I don't know why he yelled 'Hold-up.' I never killed a man before in my life. That's all I have to say."

Detective Sergeant Edgar E. Scott told the jury Rathbun admitted killing Steele with a .45-caliber pistol which he had "borrowed" from the gun rack of a guardhouse at Bolling Field. He quoted the youth as telling him that he was "out to get" a deputy prison warden in Georgia who had once struck him.

Military authorities have formally turned Rathbun over to civilian authorities for action.

[From Progress of February 1942]

**THE PEARL HARBOR REPORT**

The Roberts report to the President is a whitewash insofar as it uncovered the lack of alertness which Secretary of the Navy Knox said was the cause of the disaster at Pearl Harbor on Sunday, December 7. It places the responsibility as to who were guilty for the disaster, but it does not disclose why they were not alert when the attack came. In an address at the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, Sunday February 1, the editor, as reported in the press, asked this question:

"If the 500 saloons in the Honolulu area were not a vital contributing cause to the major military and naval disaster of American history, why were they immediately closed by military order and kept closed ever since? Why lock the stable after the horse has been stolen without disclosing to the owner why the hostler was not on the alert? Had prohibition prevailed and the law been as strictly enforced before as since the disaster, the Pearl Harbor massacre might never have occurred, with loss of nearly 3,000 officers and men, a billion dollars' worth of property, and lowered our morale, and naval prestige around the world."

**"NORMALCY AT PEARL HARBOR**

"If the 500 saloons in the Pearl Harbor area, 285 of them owned and operated by unnaturalized Japanese, were a contributing cause of the disaster because of their lack of alertness, why were they overlooked as a fruitful fifth-column source of seditious dissemination, and subversive action? And why was not that relation included in the Roberts commission report? Why must the liquor traffic always be protected against investigation and exposure, as it was in France until after the disaster?

"To suggest, as the report does, that liquor conditions were normal, and not any different than on previous Saturday nights, may mean nothing or everything. In the absence of attack it may mean nothing; under attack it may be the chief cause of defeat."

**AUTOMOBILES VERSUS ALCOHOL**

Discussing the Government's prohibition against the manufacture and purchase of automobiles, in the same address the editor said: "If the Government can prohibit the citizen from purchasing a new automobile, or tires for his old automobile, which is a blessing to society, a necessity to business, recreation for himself, and a pleasure to his family, it can prohibit his liquor, which is a curse."

**BEAM VERSUS MOTE**

If it can stop one of the major industries of the country producing 37,000,000 automo-

bibles annually and throw millions of men out of employment, it can stop the seditious and subversive liquor traffic for the duration of the war before the disaster as it stopped it at Pearl Harbor and Honolulu after the disaster.

The same Government which supplied our most potential enemy with scrap iron and steel by the shiploads, and gasoline by the hundred million gallons, to be used, like the sword of Damocles, against us, has prohibited the sugar bowl on the restaurant tables and limited American citizens to a single lump, while the liquor interest gets all the grain and coal and trucks and tires they need to convert the staff of life into nonessential and devitalizing intoxicating liquors.

#### PRESIDENTIAL PARASITES

As for the "parasites" which the President proposes to move from their own homes in Washington to make room for war workers, why not move the greatest parasite of them all, the 2,500 liquor outlets in Washington, which sell a nonessential and poisonous commodity that reduces war-work efficiency and fills our penal and charitable institutions with broken humanity?

If the President has power, as he claims to have, to take over office buildings and hotels and lodging houses, and evict retired "parasites" from their own homes, as no doubt he has, he also has power to close the parasitical liquor premises, and the parasitical liquor-selling post exchanges in the training camps without waiting on Congress to pass a prohibition law, as Abraham Lincoln abolished slavery and confiscated slave property as an act of war, without asking or waiting for the consent or authorization of Congress. In such an emergency as this Nation now faces, the abolition of the liquor traffic is more essential to victory than was the abolition of slavery.

#### THE BRAND OF CAIN

We are told in the morning papers of today that the 15,000 liquor employees in Washington are to be fingerprinted. Why? Why not fingerprint the milkmen, the grocers, the dry-goods, and other merchants? Why not fingerprint the lawyers, teachers, and preachers? Why put the brand of Cain on the liquor men? Cannot the Government find something better for those 15,000 citizens to do to help win the war than selling rum? What contribution does that make toward military efficiency? A drinking soldier may be more dangerous in war than a drinking driver may be in peace.

#### NOT ON THE ALERT

Recently the editor made a trip from Washington to fill a speaking engagement in South Carolina. It required an all-night ride to reach his Sunday engagements. On the Pullman out of Washington were three young men in military uniform, each assigned to a lower berth. They possessed 2 quart bottles of whisky and began to celebrate before the train left the terminal and continued into the small hours of the night.

When the editor left the train at 6 in the morning the three defenders of democracy were sleeping in one lower berth with their uniforms and boots on, dead to the world, with John Barleycorn in the same berth.

Had any military emergency arisen these defenders of the flag would have been no more alert than were the defenders at Pearl Harbor. This does not say that they were drunk, but their lack of alertness, their indifference to attack and their dereliction of duty, was a much more serious offense if they were sober. That would imply military incompetence which must prove very heartening to Japan and Hitler.

#### WORSE THAN WAR

Relating to the return home on furlough for Christmas dinner of a lad in uniform from a military camp, in an intoxicated con-

dition, who was met by his mother on the arrival of the train on which the editor was a passenger, the editor said:

"As a father of six, three of them sons, I am wondering what may happen to that boy at the end of a year of training in a camp where intoxicating liquors are sold, and where contraceptive appliances are supplied to the boys for sex indulgence with underworld women when they leave camp for the big city. We already know what has happened to thousands of virtuous young girls who are fascinated by the uniformed youth, particularly after visits to roadhouses, taverns, and dance halls where intoxicating liquors are sold contiguous to the camp and towns and cities within easy reach.

We know too well the relation of alcohol in any form to sex indulgence. Over 40 pregnant high-school girls are reported in the hospital of a small city contiguous to a training camp.

There are penalties which our youth may be called to pay that will be worse for them, worse for our daughters, and worse for their mothers and fathers than death in battle.

There are some things worse than war, and greater sorrow to fathers and mothers than death of sons in their country's service.

And I say to you as a father who bears in his body the marks of Old Glory, I would rather have a sober son in a concentration camp in Germany than in a service camp in America, if that son should become the victim of the drink habit, either there or in the active service of his country.

His character is worth more to me than his country, for that will last till the end of eternity, and if his country does not watch its step there is no guaranty that it will outlast the next war, if it succeeds, with its partnership with vice and rum and lust to win this war.

There is a popular song, I Didn't Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier. I did, when his country needs him. But I did not raise any one of my boys to be a drunkard, in the Army or out. And the mothers of this country, who were the best soldiers that ever marched on a field of battle to bring their boys into life, and raise them to manhood, would say the same thing. There is not a physical disability, not even insanity, that I would not prefer for one of my sons than to return from the service to his country a confirmed drunkard.

"It is impossible but that offenses come, but woe unto that man or nation by whom the offense cometh. It were better for that man, or Uncle Sam, that a millstone be hanged about his neck and he were cast into the sea."

#### THE CHURCH BEAUTIFUL

The sermon from which the above article is taken was preached in the Fountry Methodist Church, the Cathedral of Methodism, at Washington, attended by Winston Churchill and Lord Beaverbrook when recently visiting the Capitol City, of which Dr. Frederick Brown Harris is the distinguished pastor. The sermon was preached from the magnificent spiral pulpit recently dedicated in honor of Bishop William Frazer McDowell, who was a friend of the editor, as was the father of Dr. Harris, in whose pulpit he preached many times in the New Jersey Conference.

On the beautiful church calendar, Foundry Methodist Church stands in the foreground of the front page, with the great white dome of the Nation's Capitol in the distance. The announcement for the evening service on page 4 reads: "We are glad to welcome to the McDowell pulpit tonight Hon. Clinton N. Howard, a valiant knight of righteous causes. For many years across the continent his voice has been raised on behalf of the things that make our Nation great. William Jennings Bryan said: 'I have never heard his equal. I hope the world can hear this modern apostle.' It will be a joy to have him with us at the evening service."

#### LAG IN WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I should also like to say a few words at this time with reference to the lag in the production of war materials, and to place in the RECORD some additional telegrams I have received on that subject. I am receiving so many telegrams of late that I think it is my duty to present some of them to the Senate in order that Senators may know at least how some of the people in Texas and other States feel about the lag in production of war materials. I read first a telegram from H. C. White, secretary-treasurer, Temple White Co., Inc., of Diboll, Tex., as follows:

Earnestly urge you take necessary action bring war production fullest capacity.

I read a telegram from Miriam Partlow, secretary, Liberty County Defense Council, Liberty, Tex., signed by him and 24 others, as follows:

Support legislation to cut out strikes and put war production on 100-percent basis.

MIRIAM PARTLOW,

Secretary,

Liberty County Defense Council,

(And 24 others).

I read a telegram from Mrs. E. J. Daffin at Houston, Tex.:

Outlaw strikes. Lengthen work hours.

I read a telegram from John T. Beldwin, manager, Chamber of Commerce, Huntsville, Tex.:

Our board of directors has gone on record by unanimous vote protesting the controversy between the employer and the employee in vital defense plants, causing a delay in the manufacturing of defense materials the shortage of which is bringing about the untimely death of our boys on the fighting front. Every red-blooded American will certainly not be satisfied with anything short of an all-out effort for manufacturing war materials. We are confident that you feel as we do, and urge your support of the Smith bill or any other legislation that will correct the deplorable situation and stop these damnable strikes for the duration at least.

Next I read a telegram from W. R. Calhoun, Texas Cement & Plaster Co., Hamlin, Tex.:

Act now and end all strikes and the 40-hour week. Force labor individuals and capital to a 60- or 70-hour week. No more racketeering in labor, business, or politics. Give Nelson the 100 percent go signal. I have 175 workers and am sure they are 100 percent for this idea. If Senators and Congressmen do not do this at once they will be classed as slackers. We have got to win this war and to do so we must begin now at full speed. We do not need after-dinner or political speeches but do need production. We are all on the right side except the fifth columnist and you know what rough treatment they should have. We must beat our enemies without beating around the bush.

I read a telegram from Jim Maples, manager, Yellow Taxicab Co., Muskogee, Okla.:

My taxes last year were \$10,000. For many years I lived in Texas. Believe I am entitled to know why the Government permits labor racketeers to collect \$20 from day laborers, \$50 from carpenters, \$60 from painters, and \$200 from plumbers before they are permitted to work on Government financed defense projects. Will you furnish this information? Also advise why Congress continues to play



politics and make appropriations for boondoggling projects, thereby wasting money and depriving defense projects of necessary materials.

Now I read a telegram from Caleb Read, of Abilene, Tex., as follows:

No work in defense plants on holidays and kicks on 40 hours a week are absurd. Two shifts of 12 hours a day, 7 days a week would save the lives of our soldiers who give 24 hours every day and are being killed for lack of planes and munitions. We, as Americans, are willing to do anything and naturally we ask the question, What are you doing?

I read a telegram from A. E. Amerman, Jr., of Houston, Tex.:

Public is outraged at the 40-hour week, holidays, time and a half for overtime, and strikes resulting in partial utilization of war machinery. Nelson's plea for 7-day week and for full-time employment of machines should be answered immediately by legislation to abolish these home-made enemies of our war effort. Suggest you push with all your effort the abolition of 40-hour week and anti-strike legislation, and any other legislation which will immediately compel full-time operation of war machinery.

Following that is a telegram from John H. Bradley, of Alice, Tex.:

We think something ought to be done about the 40-hour-week labor law. Donald Nelson told the world that we were losing the war because we were producing only 50 percent. How about a little action and place all war production on 24-hour basis, 7 days a week? We demand that you and other Representatives get busy and straighten out this mess. It can be done, but it takes men to do it. What would happen if MacArthur would work only 40 hours a week, or does our Congress think he could or would? Action is what we want, and we believe we speak for all true Americans. We'll take care of our fifth columnists here; you take care of them in Congress.

I read now a telegram from J. T. Lunnell, of Dallas, Tex., as follows:

Why not order at once all war production on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week? We're tired of sitting here close to the border and coast, where enemy can get to us, and working day and night preparing for civilian defense, air-raid wardens, and defense-guard activities, and have the Congress refuse to act to force all-out war production. It's a blessing our soldiers don't work 40 hours a week. Action is needed—it speaks louder than all speeches and all CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

Next I read a telegram from Jess McLarry, president, Optimist Club, of Wichita Falls, Tex.:

The Optimist Club, of Wichita Falls, composed of 80 businessmen, adopted at their regular weekly luncheon today the following resolution: *Resolved*, That the club go on record as approving the stand of Donald M. Nelson that we require defense industries to operate 24 hours per day 7 days per week during the national emergency, and that the 40-hour week be abolished. Since it is apparent that the battle must be won on the assembly line and that we are losing it there as long as we manufacture anything short of full capacity, it seems imperative that as long as our boys at the front are drafted and paid only \$21 per month and have to go for weeks without taking off their clothes and put up with this until they fall asleep from exhaustion that all of us feel it is likewise imperative that our leaders take every step to stop strikes and run factories full blast. Now, therefore, it is the feeling of this club that if it was reported that our sons were drowning or imperiled by fire in a burning building that we would certainly not wait

our union hours to rescue them. This country of ours is imperiled, and unless we do bend every effort we do not deserve to win this war.

Then a telegram from C. W. Alcorn, of Houston, Tex., as follows:

Donald Nelson said we could practically double production by working 24 hours a day 7 days a week. The Wagner Act prevents this ever being done. There was no place for the Wagner Act when this country was building, and there is no place for it when we are fighting to preserve it. We demand that you act immediately to suspend it for the duration.

I now read a telegram from R. D. Shinkte, manager, Alice Chamber of Commerce, Alice, Tex.:

We want action. Why not freeze all employer-employee relation and kill all labor disputes for duration? Raise 40-hour restriction and give all-out aid to war production. Men, not politicians, are needed now.

I read a telegram from J. Arthur Lunnell, of Alice, Tex., as follows:

We think something ought to be done about the 40-hour-week labor law. Donald Nelson told the world that we were losing the war because we were producing only 50 percent. How about a little action and place all war production on 24-hour basis, 7 days a week? We demand that you and other representatives get busy and straighten out this mess. It can be done, but it takes men to do it. What would happen if MacArthur would work only 40 hours a week, or does our Congress think he could or would? Action is what we want, and we believe we speak for all true Americans. We'll take care of our fifth columnists here; you take care of them in Congress.

Finally, a telegram from Marshall Rotary Club, of Marshall, Tex., as follows:

Our people are indignant over Ford strike. Our Texas boys are dying daily due lack of war equipment. We people are cheerfully giving up tires, sugar, and other things. We insist these strikes be stopped—not next week, but today. This resolution unanimously adopted.

Mr. President, I also wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from H. V. Kaltenborn's broadcast of March 8, 1942, at 3:15 p. m., eastern war time, over the National Broadcasting Co. I shall not now take the time to read it.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM H. V. KALTENBORN'S BROADCAST  
MARCH 8, 1942

The people of the United States owe an important debt of gratitude to a Congress of Industrial Organizations labor leader. His name is Irving Abramson. He is president of the State Industrial Union Council of New Jersey. He has had the courage to call the attention of the President and people of the United States to the fact that the industrial plants of the State of New Jersey which are now turning out war material for our soldiers and sailors are working at less than half of their capacity. For more than half the time the New Jersey machines which turn out materials to build ships, planes, tanks, and guns are idle.

Why? Because the unions and the employers are unable to agree on the payment of double time for Sunday work and on the payment of overtime for every hour worked in excess of 40 in any given week.

On Washington's Birthday, the President of the United States talked to the people of the United States. He talked to employers,

to workers, to you, and to me. Here is what he said: "We shall not stop work for a single day. If any dispute arises we shall keep on working while the dispute is settled by mediation, conciliation, or arbitration."

Yet on the very holiday on which the President spoke to the Nation, some 17,000 workmen remained away from their machines on the west coast because they insisted on getting and their employers insisted on refusing double-time pay for holiday work.

Now, when the President of the United States, who is our Commander in Chief, says something, you and I have the right to suppose that it means something. Yet on the very day on which the Commander in Chief said with a ring in his voice, "We shall not stop work for a single day," 17,000 workers stopped work on that very day. And nothing was done about it. The employers were not rebuked for refusing to pay double time. The workers were not rebuked for idling. After all, there was nothing in the contracts that obliged employers to put men to work on a holiday and pay double time when those same men were free to take a day off in the middle of the week. And the union men who refused to work only acted on the advice of leaders who told them that they must insist on employers holding to the double-time provisions of their contract. It was, obviously, a case for Government intervention. But the Government only talked. It did not act.

Now the Congress of Industrial Organizations leader in New Jersey tells the President of the United States that instead of the Presidential motto: "We shall not stop work for a single day," the New Jersey motto is: "We shall stop work for 2½ days out of every 7." Will nothing be done about that, too? Or is the time at hand when the administration will realize that it can no longer sidestep its duty in the settlement of a problem that has bedeviled the production of war materials for the past 2 years? The Congress of Industrial Organizations survey in New Jersey found just two plants that were working the full 168 hours called for by Donald Nelson, head of the United States War Production Board. Which certainly proves that it takes more than Rooseveltian eloquence or Nelsonian demands to get things done either in the State of New Jersey or anywhere else in the United States.

Out of 77 war production plants surveyed in the State of New Jersey, less than one-half do any work at all on Saturdays, and only 10 out of the 77 work on Sundays. Which means that while Japan is winning the war because we lack the tools of victory, the war workers of the United States are still on a 5-day week. For don't imagine that conditions are much better in any one of the other 48 States.

And here is the tragedy. The Army has already absorbed tens of thousands of young men who might very well have been more useful in war plants than they will ever be in uniform. But by the time our war plants get ready to move from their present 49-percent basis to something nearer their 100-percent basis, draft boards will have put so many into uniforms that it may be impossible to find enough workers of the right age and the right type. Women workers will be one solution. The president of one of the country's great engineering colleges called me up the other day to express his delight with the way women are taking to his engineering courses. It seems that properly selected women students are just as capable as men in absorbing many kinds of technical instruction. The aircraft plants of California found that out long ago.

The most serious immediate bottleneck of America's war effort is ships. The U-boats are sinking ships faster than we are building them, which means that for some time to come conditions will get worse instead of better. And conditions are bad. Here is a telegram that has just come to me from New Jersey: "For many weeks commuters

on the Erie Railroad have daily viewed with dismay literally miles of packing cases, dismounted jeeps, steel beams, etc., getting more weatherbeaten as they lie in the freight-yards just west of Jersey City. If it is lack of ships, why are not the shipyards working 24 hours a day to move this vast pile of war goods?" And the echo answers, "Why?"

William H. Harrison, Director of Production of the War Production Board, tells us that there is a definite possibility that the President's production goal of 8,000,000 tons of new shipping this year will not be realized. Donald Nelson says he refuses to recognize this possibility. But recognize it or not, Mr. Nelson, there it is, and what are you going to do about it? New Jersey's Abramson has told you and the President what's wrong. He has told you about one New Jersey shipbuilding company that employs 14,500 on the first shift, 3,500 on the second, and 1,500 on the third. In one of the smaller New Jersey shipyards where two shifts are being worked, the employees, according to Mr. Abramson, appealed for the addition of a third shift for the dual purpose of cutting down their own overtime and increasing production, but the management refused. There you get the fight between the two 10-hour shifts preferred by management and the three 8-hour shifts preferred by labor. That has caused strikes, walk-outs, and labor difficulties all over the country, and no one has done anything about it.

Abramson's report also shows that we are not doing enough to train the unemployed for war jobs and that vocational training facilities are woefully inadequate to meet New Jersey's present and prospective needs for trained war workers. As a union man, we must expect him to put most of the blame for what's wrong on the employers. But he has rendered a real service in putting before the President and before Production Director Nelson the fact that in New Jersey war plants work on a half-time basis. Now let the employers in New Jersey wake up and put their case before the President and before the Director of War Production.

Thus far most of us have blamed either the unions or the employers for a situation in which both share the blame. Many employers have contracts under which the payment of more than a minimum of overtime and double time would turn profits into losses, and don't forget that while the Government will certainly take away most of the profits it cannot be held responsible for any of the losses. If employers are asked to pay workers time and one-half, as well as double time, on contracts which were made before the President called for 24 hours a day 7 days a week production, they are entitled to some sort of adjustment, and a fair-minded Government will recognize that fact. It will be easy enough to draft tax laws that will draw back to the Government in one way or another every cent of excess profits.

As for the labor unions, they have contracts with employers which provide for the payment of overtime and double time. Until they have some guaranty that the sacrifice of these provisions will not transfer additional profits to their employers they are entitled to insist upon them, and they have the right to insist that the change or abrogation of these provisions shall be for the emergency period only. The vice of the whole situation lies in the fact that the Government in Washington has tried to sidestep its responsibility. It has pussyfooted and delayed in the hope that the situation would settle itself and that it would not have to act.

This reminds me of a talk I once had while driving to the White House with a man who may well become the next President of the United States. He is close to the President and has his confidence. I was appealing to him for Presidential leadership on the ground

that the country was crying out for the next step.

"Perhaps," replied this man who knows the President, "perhaps the President is only waiting until you and those who agree with you can persuade the country to cry out more loudly and with a more certain voice."

So perhaps, if, before it is too late, 100,000,000 Americans turn their voices toward Washington and cry out, "Action, action, action," we can get things done.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that some of these telegrams and many letters which are coming to me refer to this broadcast made by Mr. Kaltenborn. They refer to statements of our President, and they also refer, as Senators have just noticed, to the speech made night before last by Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. I hope the Senate and the House of Representatives will take legislative action to back up the statement of our President, who said:

We shall not stop work for a single day. If any dispute arises we shall keep on working while the dispute is solved by mediation, conciliation, or arbitration.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will take legislative action to back up the urgent demand made by Donald Nelson, upon whose shoulders rest such grave responsibilities and such a great load at the present time, and that the Congress will enact some legislation which will start the factories into full-time operation, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as Mr. Nelson suggested, in order that there may be an increase in the production of war materials in the Nation. I hope in the final analysis Senators will also pay some heed to the voice of the people as expressed in the telegrams I have just read.

#### FERTILIZER SHORTAGE AND SMALL GRAIN CROPS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I had hoped that some of the Senators who are interested in the matter which I wish to discuss today might be present. I have from Clemson College, one of the great agricultural colleges in the South, an important document, written by the director of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics. I do not know how those on the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to Florida feel about this problem, but we are within 2 weeks of losing practically the entire small-grain crop of the South. Some time ago I called the attention of the Senate to this matter. Senators do not seem to be interested. I am not surprised that those from the West, whose soil does not need artificial fertilization, pay no heed to this question, except through long-distance sympathy; but we are confronted by the danger of a catastrophe more deadly than anything that has thus far been inflicted by our enemies. The situation is so imminent and drastic that only those of us who are acquainted with the actual facts know what is ahead.

I took this matter up with Mr. Myers of the War Production Board. He said, "We have allocated nitrates to the distributing corporations, namely, the fertilizer corporations, and they are supposed to distribute them."

There was a meeting of the farmers of Georgia and South Carolina on the

grounds of Clemson College. I should like to read a letter addressed to the South Carolina delegation by Mr. D. W. Watkins, director of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics in the State of South Carolina. The letter is addressed to Representatives BRYSON, FULMER, HARE, McMILLAN, RICHARDS, and RIVERS, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and myself. I wish to read the letter for the RECORD. The only Senator from the section interested who is present is the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSSIER in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Jersey for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMITH. No. What is the use? No one is interested in anything but election this year. We are in the midst of a tremendous "turpitude" fight. It smells more like turpentine than turpitude. [Laughter.] We are in the midst of it; yet see how many Senators are interested. That condition will be just as deadly in its subsequent effects as the danger to which I refer is in its immediate effects. We are deliberating on the moral character of a man, which is the most valuable asset he has, even though he be worth billions of dollars. We are asked to damn him forever on the basis of the evidence which has been given. Some persons may think that the ruin of a man's record is a trivial thing. I shall not enter upon that question. Later I shall have something to say on it. The majority report criticizes the minority for having had the temerity to question certain acts of the majority. I will question them. At the proper time I will give my view on that mess.

I should like to read the letter to which I have referred:

At a State-wide marketing conference called at Clemson for Friday and Saturday, March 6 and 7 (program enclosed) a considerable number of farmers present brought up the matter of nitrate of soda distribution as it is working out in South Carolina. There was considerable discussion of this subject and general agreement that as a means of securing equitable distribution of the available supplies of nitrates the plan has broken down.

That is what I called to the attention of Mr. Myers this morning. I said, "You ought to have allocated so much to South Carolina. What steps have you taken to see that the individual farmer who needs fertilizer will get it?" He said, "We cannot go into that."

Continuing with the letter:

The main reason why it has broken down appears to be that the plan of rationing does not extend down to the farms but stops with a few very large manufacturers or dealers. Some farmers who used nitrates last year are securing none this year. Others seem to be obtaining widely varying percentages of the amounts used last year. There seems to be no relation between the amounts received by farmers and the amounts needed on this year's grain crop. Reports are frequent to the effect that farmers must buy mixed fertilizers from dealers



in order to get any nitrates. This entire procedure seems to be in a state of confusion as far as agriculture is concerned. I have not heard any farmer say that he is insistent on having a supply of nitrate of soda in spite of needs of munitions. However, there seems to be no doubt that the method being followed is full of inequities. Some farmers who ordinarily home-mix their fertilizers are this year unable to obtain materials. Others who used other kinds of nitrates last year as a top dressing for oats and wheat are unable to secure these other types this year.

The resolution passed at the meeting this morning with instructions to forward copies to our Congressional delegation is attached. The particular example mentioned in the resolution with the correspondence that has taken place in connection with it is attached. Please note that up to this time this farmer, Mr. Pegues, has been unable to secure any nitrate whatever. There are many others. The kind of replies we get to inquiries are typified in the letter from Mr. George W. McCarty of the War Production Board in which he says: "Your sources of supply should be such as to enable you to get your fair share of nitrate of soda that is allocated by the month." Another letter to Mr. Pegues from Dr. P. H. Groggins says: "We are confident that the nitrate situation in our Southeastern States should now be in good condition." Unfortunately, neither statement describes the confused situation and it will soon be too late for top dressing to be of any service on this year's small grain crop.

There were expressions at this meeting to the effect that the delegation in Congress from South Carolina might be able to help straighten out this mess. It is with that view that I was instructed to forward this information to you. If there is anything that this office can do to help, we shall be only too glad.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. WATKINS,  
Director.

I wish to read the resolution which the meeting of farmers adopted. I was told at the War Production Board, "Yes; we have sent the soda down there. As to the distribution, we leave that to the manufacturers of fertilizer." There is an extension service; and under the Seed Loan Act there is a man in every district who visits every farmer. Why could not a farmer be asked to fill out a card showing how much he used last year, and let the distributing agent send each farmer his quota, whether it be a third, a fourth, or what not? As it is, some are receiving a third, some are receiving none, and some are receiving as much as 50 percent.

This is the resolution:

CLEMSON, S. C., March 7, 1942.

Resolution passed by Marketing Conference for submission to the War Production Board and the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations:

"Be it resolved:

"South Carolina farmers complain that the nitrate of soda allocated to this State by the War Production Board is not being equitably rationed. Many farmers are able to buy little, if any, nitrate of soda, although from released figures it appears that South Carolina has already been allocated as much, or more, nitrate of soda as ever used during a similar period. Apparently the nitrate soda allocated to this State is not reaching the hands of the farmers as intended.

"For example, Pegues Bros., of Bennettsville, S. C., purchased 66 tons of nitrate of soda in 1941 from the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Co. Said company now—in a letter dated March 3, 1942—notify Pegues Bros.

that they will be unable to supply them any nitrate of soda in 1942. This is one of many cases in the State.

"We feel that this matter is of such vital importance that the War Production Board should take immediate steps to see that available supplies of nitrate of soda are equitably rationed to South Carolina farmers."

I now wish to read a letter from Pegues Bros. to the Office of Production Management. I suppose the reason for singling out Pegues Bros. is that they are, perhaps, the largest farmers in Marlboro County, which is the banner cotton county of South Carolina.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,  
Washington, D. C.

Attention Mr. Howe.

I do not know who he is.

DEAR SIR:

This is a letter Mr. Pegues wrote to them:

In 1941 we purchased fertilizer for our farm from the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corporation, of Wilmington, N. C. In that purchase was 66 tons of nitrate of soda, as follows:

Then follow the dates and amounts of their purchases.

Their sales manager told me at their office yesterday, February 9, that their interpretation of the Office of Production Management ruling was that they were not bound to sell us any soda for 1942 crop since we did not buy our mixed fertilizer from them this year (1942). They feel that Maybank Fertilizer Co., Charleston, S. C., should sell us our 1942 soda allotment since we purchased our mixed fertilizers from them this year (1942).

Pegues Bros. had changed their purchases from the Virginia Co. to the Maybank Co. I continue to quote from the letter—

On the other hand, Maybank takes the other side and told me that their interpretation of the Office of Production Management ruling was that they are to take care of the ones that purchased soda from them in 1941 and not base their sales on the mixed-fertilizer sales.

Please advise me by return mail where and how much soda we can get for our 1942 crops. As it stands now, we are ostracized because we changed our brand of fertilizer. And we appreciate very much if you advise us by return mail as to what steps to take.

Yours very truly,

PEGUES BROS.

This is the reply, written on the letterhead of the War Production Board, Materials Division, Chemicals Branch, Washington, D. C., dated February 12, 1942:

Mr. V. R. PEGUES,  
Pegues Bros., Route 4,  
Bennettsville, S. C.

DEAR MR. PEGUES: This will acknowledge your letter of February 10 with reference to soda purchased by you last year.

It is not within the province of this department to attempt to tell the manufacturers and distributors to whom they shall sell the soda that is allocated to them.

It is allocated to the manufacturers, but the department does not tell them to whom they shall distribute it.

Your sources of supply should be such as to enable you to get your fair share of nitrate of soda that is allocated by the month.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE W. MCCARTY,  
Consultant, Nitrogen Unit.

I have in my hand another letter, similar to Mr. Pegues' letter. I shall not read it; but I do wish to read a letter from Mr. Groggins, Chief of the Chemicals Division, United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Agricultural Defense Relations—the outfit here that is writing to these men, but the farmers never have heard of it:

DEAR MR. PEGUES: Mr. Watkins, in his letter of February 23, has given you an accurate picture of the sodium-nitrate situation as of that date. Since then two encouraging steps have been taken: First, we asked the administrator of the sodium-nitrate order to advance March deliveries to the latter part of February. Then we asked that the advanced deliveries be changed to additional releases. Both of these recommendations have been accepted.

We are confident that the nitrate situation in our Southeastern States should now be in good condition. As a matter of fact, some States have this year received more nitrate of soda than they did in 1941.

I do not know what States they are; he did not say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the letters I have before me, including those from which I have read, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEMSON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,  
Clemson, S. C., March 7, 1942.

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,  
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER,  
HON. BUTLER B. HARE  
HON. JAMES L. McMILLAN,  
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS,  
HON. MENDEL L. RIVERS,  
Members, House of Representatives,  
HON. ELLISON D. SMITH,  
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
United States Senators,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: At a State-wide marketing conference called at Clemson for Friday and Saturday March 6 and 7 (program enclosed), a considerable number of farmers present brought up the matter of nitrate of soda distribution as it is working out in South Carolina. There was considerable discussion of this subject and general agreement that as a means of securing equitable distribution of the available supplies of nitrates the plan has broken down. The main reason why it has broken down appears to be that the plan of rationing does not extend down to the farms, but stops with a few very large manufacturers or dealers. Some farmers who used nitrates last year are securing none this year. Others seem to be obtaining widely varying percentages of the amounts used last year. There seems to be no relation between the amounts received by farmers and the amounts needed on this year's grain crop. Reports are frequent to the effect that farmers must buy mixed fertilizers from dealers in order to get any nitrates. This entire procedure seems to be in a state of confusion as far as agriculture is concerned. I have not heard any farmer say that he is insistent on having a supply of nitrate of soda in spite of needs for munitions. However, there seems to be no doubt that the method being followed is full of inequities. Some farmers who ordinarily home mix their fertilizers are this year unable to obtain materials. Others who used other kinds of nitrates last year as a top dressing for oats and wheat are unable to secure these other types this year.

The resolution passed at the meeting this morning with instructions to forward copies to our congressional delegation is attached. The particular example mentioned in the

resolution with the correspondence that has taken place in connection with it is attached. Please note that up to this time this farmer, Mr. Pegues, has been unable to secure any nitrate whatever. There are many others. The kind of replies we get to inquiries are typified in the letter from Mr. George W. McCarty, of the War Production Board, in which he says: "Your sources of supply should be such as to enable you to get your fair share of nitrate of soda that is allocated by the month." Another letter to Mr. Pegues from Dr. P. H. Groggins says, "We are confident that the nitrate situation in our Southeastern States should now be in good condition." Unfortunately, neither statement describes the confused situation, and it will soon be too late for top dressing to be of any service on this year's small grain crop.

There were expressions at this meeting to the effect that the delegation in Congress from South Carolina might be able to help straighten out this mess. It is with that view that I was instructed to forward this information to you. If there is anything that this office can do to help, we shall be only too glad.

Sincerely yours,  
D. W. WATKINS, Director.

CLEMSON, S. C., March 7, 1942.

Resolution passed by marketing conference for submission to the War Production Board and the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations:

*Be it resolved:*

South Carolina farmers complain that the nitrate of soda allocated to this State by the War Production Board is not being equitably rationed. Many farmers are able to buy little, if any, nitrate of soda, although from released figures it appears that South Carolina has already been allocated as much or more nitrate of soda as ever used during a similar period. Apparently the nitrate of soda allocated to this State is not reaching the hands of the farmers, as intended.

For example, Pegues Bros., of Bennettsville, S. C., purchased 66 tons of nitrate of soda in 1941 from the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corporation. Said company now (in a letter dated March 3, 1942) notify Pegues Bros. that they will be unable to supply them any nitrate of soda in 1942. This is one of many cases in the State.

We feel that this matter is of such vital importance that the War Production Board should take immediate steps to see that available supplies of nitrate of soda are equitably rationed to South Carolina farmers.

PEGUES BROS.,  
Bennettsville, S. C., February 10, 1942.  
OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,  
Washington, D. C.  
Attention Mr. Howe.

DEAR SIR: In 1941 we purchased fertilizer for our farm from the Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corporation, of Wilmington, N. C. In that purchase was 66 tons of nitrate of soda, as follows: February 25, 15 tons; March 12, 8 tons; May 9, 14.5 tons; May 12, 14.5 tons; and May 13, 14 tons.

Their sales manager told me at their office yesterday, February 9, that their interpretation of the Office of Production Management ruling was that they were not bound to sell us any soda for 1942 crop, since we did not buy our mixed fertilizer from them this year (1942). They feel that Maybank Fertilizer Co., Charleston, S. C., should sell us our 1942 soda allotment, since we purchased our mixed fertilizers from them this year (1942). On the other hand, Maybank takes the other side, and told me that their interpretation of the Office of Production Management ruling was that they are to take care of the ones that purchased soda from them in 1941 and not base their sales on the mixed-fertilizer sales.

Please advise me by return mail where and how much soda we can get for our 1942 crops. As it stands now, we are ostracized because we changed our brand of fertilizer. And we appreciate very much if you advise us by return mail as to what steps to take.

Yours very truly,

PEGUES BROS.,  
By V. R. PEGUES.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,  
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1942.  
Mr. V. R. PEGUES,  
Bennettsville, S. C.

DEAR MR. PEGUES: This will acknowledge your letter of February 10, with reference to soda purchased by you last year.

It is not within the province of this Department to attempt to tell the manufacturers and distributors to whom they shall sell the soda that is allocated to them.

Your sources of supply should be such as to enable you to get your fair share of nitrate of soda that is allocated by the month.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE W. MCCARTY,  
Consultant, Nitrogen Unit.

BENNETTSVILLE, S. C., February 21, 1942.  
Mr. D. W. WATKINS,  
Director of Extension,  
Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

DEAR MR. WATKINS: Mr. V. R. Pegues, a big farmer in Marlboro County, asked me to write to you in regard to helping him secure nitrate of soda for his 400 acres of small grain, thinking that you in your position might be of service to him and other farmers in like predicament.

He bought mixed goods and 66 tons of soda from V. C. Fertilizer Co. in Wilmington, N. C., in 1941. In 1942 he bought mixed goods from Maybank in Charleston. Maybank refuses to furnish soda this year and tells him that V. C. is supposed to furnish soda, because he bought soda from them last year; V. C. refuses to furnish soda this year and informs him that it is up to Maybank to furnish soda this year because he bought mixed goods from them.

Mr. Pegues has visited Bob Hamilton in Columbia, Mr. Roy Jones, and Barrett Co. He has also written letters to the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, Congressmen, and Senators; as yet he has gotten no satisfaction or any promise of any soda.

At a meeting of county war boards and Agricultural Adjustment Administration administrative officers, held in Florence recently, strong resolutions were passed and sent to Congressmen and Senators and the Secretary of Agriculture. No answer has been received to these resolutions.

Without top dressings, small-grain crops will be materially curtailed. Upon these crops depends essential war products such as pork, beef, poultry, and dairy products.

Prompt action is necessary if this situation is to be remedied. Anything that you can do will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

COLIN McLAURIN, County Agent.

BENNETTSVILLE, S. C., February 25, 1942.  
VIRGINIA-CAROLINA CHEMICAL  
CORPORATION,  
Wilmington, N. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am informed that the V. C. Chemical Corporation are authorized or instructed to sell the farmer 30 percent of the soda that was purchased from them in 1941, the delivery to be made in the corresponding month.

On February 25, 1941, I bought 15 tons of soda from you, and therefore please ship to me, Kollocks, S. C., at once, 4.5 tons for February this year. In March last year you

sold me 8 tons of soda, so kindly ship me March 1, 2.4 tons soda.

Make sight draft bill lading attached on me through the South Carolina National Bank, Cheraw, S. C.

Yours very truly,

PEGUES BROS.,  
V. R. PEGUES.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF AGRICULTURAL DEFENSE RELATIONS,  
Washington, March 2, 1942.

Mr. V. R. PEGUES,  
Bennettsville, S. C.

DEAR MR. PEGUES: Mr. Watkins in his letter of February 23, has given you an accurate picture of the sodium nitrate situation as of that date. Since then two encouraging steps have been taken. First, we asked the Administrator of the sodium nitrate order to advance March deliveries to the latter part of February. Then we asked that the advanced deliveries be changed to additional releases. Both of these recommendations have been accepted.

We are confident that the nitrate situation in our southeastern States should now be in good condition. As a matter of fact, some States have this year received more nitrate of soda than they did in 1941.

Yours very truly,

P. H. GROGGINS,  
Chief, Chemicals Division.

VIRGINIA-CAROLINA CHEMICAL CORPORATION,  
Wilmington, N. C., March 3, 1942.  
Messrs. PEGUES BROS.,  
Bennettsville, S. C.

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of February 25.

The limited supply of nitrate of soda allocated us by both producers is preventing our being able to supply the normal demand of our regular customers. We regret, therefore, that we will be unable to sell you any nitrate of soda this season.

Yours very truly,

H. N. HAYDEN,  
Assistant Manager.

Mr. SMITH. What I want, Mr. President, is to get some action from some one, from some source, to have a stop put to this passing the buck. If we go to one man he says, "Well, go to Mr. A." When we go to him he says, "Well, go to Mr. B"—and then back to Mr. A, and so on. In the meantime the small-grain crop of the South and Southeast will be practically a failure.

I talked to Mr. Myers this morning, and he seemed to be surprised that there is not an adequate supply of this element essential to our production. I become so tired trying to get something done. It is much like the story in regard to the doctrine of predestination. A man asked, "If I pray and live an exemplary life, but am not chosen, will I go to hell?"

The answer was, "Yes."

Then he asked, "If I drink and carouse and cuss, but am chosen, will I go to heaven?"

The answer was, "Yes."

Then he went away, and after awhile came back, and said, "I have got that thing fixed. It is like this:

"I can and I can't.

"I will and I won't.

"I'll be damned if I do.

"And damned if I don't."

That is the situation of the farmer today. [Laughter.]



Of course, the metropolitan press and administration leaders denounce the so-called farm bloc. I do not know where they are. There have been a few who express a desire to help the farmers; but according to the press and certain leaders we are proposing things that will lead to inflation. I think that every man who criticizes the farmer for his effort to get sufficient money with which to live decently should be forced to work with his hands on a farm for 12 months. I wish we had a law to that effect. Let a man go to work on a farm in my State and start to plant cotton, break up the land, lay off the rows, distribute the fertilizer, bed the cotton, rustle around with the cotton planter until he knows how to keep the cotton on the bed; then, when the cotton grows a little, chop it to a stand; then, along about the middle of June, when the sun becomes about as big as a saucer, the sunlight is beating down on him, his shadow is falling under him, and he is sweating and tugging, he would think cotton was worth a dollar a pound; yes, indeed.

It is very easy to sit in a nice, secluded room, with an opportunity to be a "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t," and criticize a man who works on a farm, who is subject to all the changes of the seasons, to insect ravages, and tell him about how to become rich and independent.

I hope something may be done. I had hoped that those who are interested in this tragic situation would at once take steps to relieve the farmers in their predicament.

Not only that but next month and the month after in my section of the country corn will not make a crop unless the soil is highly fertilized.

Once I was accused of being the biggest liar in the Senate because I said that one man in my State had made 242 bushels of corn to the acre. The members of the committee said I was the most notorious liar who ever came to Congress. But that yield is of record in the Department. Jerry Moore made 230-some bushels. I have learned how to make it, but have not yet learned how to measure it. I will get to that later. There is hardly any telling what can be produced to the acre with a proper concentration of fertilizer. I do not know what is the matter with those who are dealing with the fertilizer situation. They know more about farming than I do. They know where to send the stuff, but their attitude seems to be: If the farmer gets it, all right; but if he does not get it, why that is too bad.

I do not want to take up the time of the Senate and divert it from this desperate fight to try to damn someone. I think if things keep on we may elect the object of their wrath President of the United States. It looks that way to me. I shall not be a party to it; I want that understood now.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that in this matter which affects every State on the Atlantic seaboard, from Maine to Florida, some method will be used to enable the farmers to obtain this ingredient so that at least a small-grain crop may be assured.

There is not a contract hand on my farm—not one. W. P. A. and P. W. A.,

and so forth, and so forth, have got them all.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have received some information from some of the farmers in Texas indicating that they, too, believe there is something rotten in Denmark about the commercial fertilizer situation.

Mr. SMITH. Denmark? Something rotten in Denmark? The whole darn business is rotten. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have prepared a resolution asking for the appointment of a committee of three Senators to make an investigation of the whole commercial fertilizer business. If the Senator has no objection, and unless the Senator from South Carolina intends to submit some resolution or make some motion, I shall ask unanimous consent to submit my resolution and have it referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. Well, I have been here a long time, and I have found that in our investigations we have investigated to the benefit of the people being investigated; that generally has been the result of the investigations in the past. However, I should be very glad to have the Senator submit the resolution and let it go to my committee. I do not think they will do anything.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator, and I submit the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 229) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

*Resolved*, That a special committee of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the supply of commercial fertilizers in existence which are available for the use of American agriculture; (2) the supply of raw materials available for the manufacture of commercial fertilizers; (3) the current prices of such fertilizers and whether or not action should be taken to reduce such prices, to freeze them, or to prevent them from increasing unduly; and (4) such other matters relating to the production and distribution of such fertilizers as the committee may deem it appropriate to study and investigate with a view to the establishment of a national policy designed to make adequate supplies of such fertilizers available to American farmers at reasonable prices. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh Congress to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the com-

mittee, which shall not exceed \$10,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH. Now, Mr. President, I want to say what I have got to say, but I do not feel much like speaking. I do not like the precedent of going back into the history of Senators for 25 or 30 years. If we apply the same rule generally which it is sought to apply in the present instance, we would not have a quorum here. I think some of us are like an old Negro, Uncle Bill, who was honest and truthful, and who had a son named Wes, who was a playmate of mine. One day my brother caught Wes stealing eggs, caught him red-handed. My brother said, "Wes, take these eggs and walk with me to your Uncle Bill." So they went to Uncle Bill and my brother said, "I caught Wes stealing these eggs; here they are." Old Uncle Bill reached over and pulled down a limb from a peach tree and said, "I will teach you not to let the buckra catch you stealing." He was not beating him for stealing eggs; he was beating him for letting the buckra catch him. Some of us may not be immune from attack because we have not as yet been found out. I think that the Biblical expression, "Let him without sin cast the first stone," is very applicable.

#### PHYSICAL FITNESS ACTIVITIES OF OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, during the absence from the Chamber of the Senator from Virginia earlier today the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] read to the Senate, I understand, a newspaper statement which had been made by Mr. Jack Kelly, United States Director of Physical Fitness of the Office of Civilian Defense, in which statement Mr. Kelly says that the attitude of the Senator from Virginia is "a classic example of one of our national leaders boondoggling in Congress instead of focusing his attention on what is happening in the South Pacific and in Europe," and this because I exposed the fact Mr. Kelly had appointed a national coordinator of bowling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I wrote to Mr. Landis, the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, with respect to the fact that a United States bowling coordinator had been appointed in the Office of Civilian Defense. I never said that the appointee Mr. Willem was receiving any compensation from the Government. I simply made an inquiry as to whether he was or not.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the reply made by Mr. Landis and my response to his letter. These letters explain all I have said and give both sides of the argument.

Mr. President, I can say that not only has Mr. Kelly appointed a coordinator of bowling but he has appointed a number of other coordinators as a part of civilian defense; he has appointed, for instance, a coordinator of ping pong, who is connected at this time with the Office of Civilian Defense. He has appointed a coordinator of badminton; he has appointed a coordinator of archery, of bag

punching, of weight lifting, of billiards, of miniature golf, of paddle ball and paddle tennis, of code ball, canoeing, camping, and other activities. I will insert very shortly in the RECORD a statement of those who have been appointed to these positions, 61 of them in all, by Mr. Kelly as a part at the present time of the Office of Civilian Defense.

I have never charged that there were any payments made to these particular persons, but I wish to say, in view of Mr. Kelly's statement, that yesterday Senator Guffey's office asked me to see Mr. Kelly, which I did. During the conversation Mr. Kelly said that the physical fitness, of which he is the head, should be provided with an appropriation of \$1,000,000 of Federal funds yearly and that unless as much as \$300,000 yearly in the form of a Federal appropriation was made he intended to resign.

So, while these persons who have been appointed as a part of the civilian defense program may not be receiving any compensation at this time, I have Mr. Kelly's own statement that he expects to urge a greatly increased appropriation for his division. Within the next 36 hours, as soon as I can obtain the information, I will insert the names of those who have been appointed as coordinators of 61 sports and recreations in connection with the national defense program. I favor exercise and recreation but I do not believe such activities have any part in a program of national defense, nor do I favor regimenting the American people by the Federal Government as is being proposed in this very extended program. This can be accomplished by the public schools and other agencies. To me it is fantastic that in the day of great peril such tomfoolery should be indulged in by a defense branch of the Government.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Mr. Bob Ruark, appearing in the Washington Daily News which I have reason to believe are substantially correct, and I ask that they be inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters ordered inserted in the RECORD on request of Mr. BYRD are as follows:

MARCH 9, 1942.

HON. JAMES M. LANDIS,  
Director, Office of Civilian Defense,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LANDIS: The Daily News of Chicago, on March 4, contained a picture of Jack M. Willem, of Chicago, as United States bowling coordinator in the Office of Civilian Defense, wherein he is enlisting the aid of Gloria De Mala and Adele Valette, whose pictures are likewise published, in a movement to enroll 25,000,000 men, women, and children in a program to "roll their way to physical fitness."

In the list of employees, and those holding official positions in your organization, which you furnished me, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the name of Mr. Willem is not included, but I have received a telegram from Raymond J. Kelley, Chicago, in charge of the sixth civilian defense region, stating that Jack M. Willem is the national coordina-

tor of bowling and attached to your physical-fitness division.

By reason of this omission from the list you furnished the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and likewise the omission of the dancer, Miss Mayris Chaney, although you later acknowledged that Miss Chaney was employed on the date you made your report, and said the omission of her name was an inadvertent error, I am asking that you recheck carefully all the information you have given the committee, for the purpose of ascertaining whether other omissions occurred, in addition to the two above mentioned.

This announcement, on March 4, that the Office of Civilian Defense was undertaking a national campaign for the purpose of enrolling 25,000,000 men, women, and children to bowl, and that this activity is a part of the national defense program, astonished me, as no mention was made of this activity when you appeared before the committee on February 27.

Such a program will certainly be costly, if organized on this scale, and may I ask if it is your purpose to undertake this program? And, may I add further that public resentment against boondoggling such as this in connection with our national defense program has reached a point where it is imperative, in my judgment, that you strip your agency of those activities that are not related directly to national defense.

This letter is occasioned, first, by the fact that this activity and Mr. Willem's name were omitted from the information you furnished the committee, and, then, to express to you again my strong condemnation of any activity of this nature in connection with the defense program, in which activities of this nature have no place whatever. Already, public confidence in our defense program has been undermined by just such activities as this.

With best wishes, I am,  
Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

THE DIRECTOR OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,  
Washington, March 10, 1942.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Mr. Jack Willem, of Chicago, to whom you refer in your letter of March 9, 1942, was named as bowling coordinator on February 17, 1942, by Mr. Jack Kelly, the head of the Physical Fitness Division. Mr. Willem's appointment is purely on a volunteer basis. He has not, nor will he be, entitled to receive a nickel from the Federal Government. For that reason there was no occasion for putting his name on the list that was furnished your committee.

Mr. Willem is spending his own money and his own time and has tried to increase bowling facilities for industrial workers. In Chicago, for example, he has, with the help of Mayor Kelly, succeeded in keeping many of the bowling alleys open on a 24-hour basis so that industrial workers on a night shift can have an opportunity to engage in that healthy recreation. Surely there can be no objection to activities of that kind which cost the United States Government nothing and which give the men in the production line the kind of relaxation that they need.

Although this is one of the activities that belongs to the Physical Fitness Division which is on the point of transfer to another agency, it is one that I personally believe is distinctly worth while, carried on as it is without any expense to the United States Government, but at the personal expense of the leaders of those 22,000,000 bowlers who regard it as a healthy sport in the American tradition.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. LANDIS, Director.

MARCH 10, 1942.

DR. JAMES M. LANDIS,  
Director, the Office of Civilian Defense,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. LANDIS: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of even date, in which you state that Mr. Jack Willem was appointed, without salary, as national bowling coordinator with the Office of Civilian Defense, as of February 17, by Mr. Jack Kelly, the head of your Physical Fitness Division.

You state further that bowling is an activity that you personally believe to be distinctly worth while, carried on, as it is, "without any expense to the United States Government."

Since the receipt of your letter I have seen illustrated posters, printed in colors, that appear to have been done at rather substantial cost, entitled "Keep them rolling, hit the head pin with Uncle Sam," with a notation that they were printed at the United States Government Printing Office, and they must have been paid for out of Government funds.

The National Duckpin Bowling Congress is, I am informed, affiliated with this movement, and certainly considerable cost ultimately will result in organizing 25,000,000 bowlers to bowl for national defense, with great profit to commercial bowling alleys.

However, I think that you entirely miss the point which I endeavored to make in my former letter, and that is that dancing, bowling, track running, and other physical activities, while all right in their place, should not be functions of the Office of Civilian Defense. From the time Mrs. Roosevelt defended the employment of dancers to teach the art of dancing as a part of national defense the whole movement of national defense, vitally important as it is, has been much discredited in the public mind.

The fact remains that Mr. Willem has been appointed officially as National Bowling Coordinator by the Office of Civilian Defense, and your endorsement has been given to this activity as a part of the national defense program, which makes it possible for those engaged in the commercial bowling business and the manufacture of equipment for bowling to exploit the enormous advertising value incident to recognizing such an activity as a part of the defense program.

The real function of the Office of Civilian Defense, namely, the protective defense of America, is so vital and important for our security and welfare that again I express the earnest hope that you will immediately strip your agency of these nonessentials and thereby obtain to a greater degree than at present the cooperation of the American people in the real work that you have to do.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

[From the Washington Daily News]  
MORE COORDINATORS RIGHT HERE: OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE HORSESHOE-PITCHING DEPARTMENT PROMISES TO SAVE THE NATION  
(By Bob Ruark)

While Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) fulminates on Capitol Hill at a bowling coordinator away out in Chicago for his connection with the Office of Civilian Defense, he might have aimed his darts at a closer target. For your information, Senator, right here in the shadow of the Capitol are members of an Office of Civilian Defense sports board embracing 35 departments.

The horseshoe-pitching chief of the Office of Civilian Defense's muscle-building program, for instance, is Harry T. Woodfield, 734 Nineteenth Street NE. The rifle-shooting boss is C. B. Lister, secretary-treasurer of the National Rifle Association. That building,



Senator, is located at 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., where all can see.

What's more, the coordinator of Negro sports, Edwin B. Henderson, is recreation adviser for Negro schools here. You ought to look more closely, Senator.

#### PLEASED OVER PUBLICITY

Mr. Woodfield, president of the National Horseshoe Pitching Association, hopes his connection with the Office of Civilian Defense will bring barnyard golf into the homes of thousands whose former idea of a ringer was a race horse operating under false colors. Mr. Woodfield is quite frank to say his association is delighted to join hands with the Office of Civilian Defense in order to obtain publicity that never before was available.

Working with the guidance and blessing of Handsome Jack Kelly's physical-fitness unit, Mr. Woodfield's program is to increase membership and interest in shoe-flinging clubs all over the Nation. He answers all questions about staging tournaments, forming clubs, laying out courts, and related stuff. So far he has had no funds, he says, either for the procurement of equipment or promotion of his sport.

#### GOOD FOR STOMACH MUSCLES

Mr. Woodfield, a former acrobat, says that "in horseshoe pitching lies the physical salvation of the Nation.

"It's the greatest sport I ever saw for keeping you in general good shape," he says. "I only took it up a few years ago, but it's done wonders for me. One of its chief benefits is a strengthening of the stomach muscles, which is wonderful for taking aches and pains out of people—women especially—who sit hunched over desks all day.

"It doesn't cost much. You can get a set of shoes for a couple of dollars. You can set up a court almost anywhere—even if you're traveling. I'm grateful for this chance to get enough publicity to spread its benefits over the country. When I get hold of a good thing I like to let everybody else in on it."

#### WANTS COURTS FOR STENOGRS

Mr. Woodfield hopes eventually to get funds to set up pitching courts around the Government buildings, so that stenographers can use them at lunch hour or after work. He is making a survey now to see how much equipment is available in Washington proper. There are only about 5,000,000 fingers in the country, Mr. Woodfield says, and he'd like to double that number in a year or so.

Mr. Lister, head of the National Rifle Association here, is going along with an Office of Civilian Defense rifle-shooting program that is nothing new to his association.

"We've been conducting the same program for a little matter of 70 years," Mr. Lister says. "The Office of Civilian Defense idea merely overlapped. And it seems to me that teaching civilians to shoot is one thing that should be included in a national defense scheme.

#### PROGRAM FOR TYROS

"The National Rifle Association hasn't had to do much to conform with the Office of Civilian Defense's shooting program. We've been organizing shooting units all over the Nation for years. But we have eliminated all championship competition, in order to conserve ammunition, and now we're aiming chiefly at the training of tyros—people who've never shot before."

It is quite likely that the rifle-shooting program, which oddly enough falls under the jurisdiction of Mr. Kelly's physical fitness outfit, won't flourish too widely, because of an increasing ammunition shortage. The rifle association gets no priorities on powder and bullets because of the Office of Civilian Defense connection, Mr. Lister said.

#### MORE COORDINATORS

If Senator BYRD really wants to whet his teeth on some fine adjuncts of Mr. Kelly's

fitness program, let him consider the coordinators of the following sports:

Badminton: R. Ward Starrett, S. Dearborn Street, Chicago.

Archery: H. A. McCune, Ben Pearson, Inc., Pine Bluff, Ark.

Bag punching: Albert A. Nino, 7052 Aberdeen Road, Upper Darby, Pa.

Billiards: Charles C. Peterson, 629 S. Wabash Avenue, Chicago.

Canoeing: Theo. Altender, 1217 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia.

Camping: Robert Lechner, 927 Carteret Avenue, Trenton, N. J.

Code ball: William E. Code, 2306 North Clark Street, Chicago. (Editor's note—What the devil is code ball?)

Miniature golf: Frank Beal, 312 East Thirtieth Street, New York City.

Paddle ball and paddle tennis: Also Mr. Beal, same address.

Weight lifting: Robert Hoffman, 51 North Broad Street, York, Pa.

There's a raft of similar coordinators, including skiing and trapshooting. But that ought to be enough.

#### SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220), which is as follows:

*Resolved*, That the case of WILLIAM LANGER does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion or any punishment by two-thirds vote, because Senator LANGER is neither charged with nor proven to have committed disorderly behavior during his membership in the Senate.

*Resolved*, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the Senate took a recess yesterday we were discussing paragraph 11, page 68, of the majority report of the committee in connection with the exclusion of Senator LANGER, of North Dakota. At that time the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was discussing the sale of bonds by a number of counties in the State of North Dakota to the State Bank of North Dakota, as well as the deal consummated by one Gregory Brunk, who was one of the bond salesmen, for the purchase of some 5,600 acres of land from Senator LANGER in North Dakota.

I continue to read from the report where the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] left off yesterday, starting at the top of page 73:

Gregory Brunk was not only busy during 1937 and 1938 in making huge profits from these bond transactions but he was also busily engaged in real-estate transactions with the respondent. It is significant that these real-estate deals were consummated one after another at about the same time these bond issues were being sold. During the 2 years in which these enormous profits were made, the records show, and it is undisputed, that Gregory Brunk, in the name of the Des Moines Realty Co., purchased from the respondent over 5,600 acres of land in North Dakota. Different types of deeds were drawn and in some instances contracts for deeds were made. Brunk purchased all of this land, sight unseen. Instead of going to North Dakota to examine the land, examine the title, and examine encumbrances and liens, if any, he sent his law partner with instructions to do whatever Governor LANGER thought best. Gregory Brunk paid to LANGER, in all, the sum of \$56,800, and when Brunk was asked what he thought those lands were worth when he paid \$56,800 for

them he replied, "I don't have judgment about it, and I did not pretend to have judgment."

Senator Lucas asked the following:

"And that did not make any difference to you, as to what the lands were worth. You were willing to take Senator LANGER's word for that, and you were willing to invest at that time \$56,000 in lands you did not know anything about, that this never made any particular difference, that you never made any particular record investigation as to whether the title was clear or whether there were any delinquent assessments or anything else against them?"

"Mr. BRUNK. I did just that. \* \* \*

"And I told that story to them, and I said in my last paragraph:

"I sat in the defense of the Lieutenant Governor of Iowa and an alleged conspirator of his when some of the same forces of Government in Washington were attempting to eliminate the Lieutenant Governor because he disagreed with some of the ambitions of some of the men in his own party here. Fortunately, a fair court and a fair jury presided and nothing further came of the charges. The people of the State of Iowa reelected the Lieutenant Governor after a full airing of the charges, and it is my own personal opinion that if these political crimes are debated on the public platform instead of in the criminal courts it would be more wholesome. It would seem to me that in view of the appeals for campaign contributions which you and I know are repeatedly being made upon most officeholders that even a sense of humor would dictate the absurdity of the proceedings in North Dakota.

"I know that you will pardon my rambling in this regard, but I feel quite strongly about it."

"I felt so strongly about it that I gave him \$56,800 for land I didn't see.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is the point that I want to know more about.

Mr. President, the chairman at that time was the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and if I may digress for just a moment, I wish to say that the Senator from New Mexico was as much interested in this inquiry as was any other member of the committee. He sat for days and listened to the testimony presented at the hearings by the various witnesses, and I personally know that he made a lengthy and thorough investigation of the evidence obtained by the investigators in North Dakota. I do not believe there is a more conscientious and sincere public servant in the Senate than Senator CARL HATCH, of New Mexico, and I am sure that, on every occasion he has given his time and his effort and his ability to matters involving either a legal or a moral turpitude question, Senators as a whole have had tremendous respect for his conclusions and deductions upon the subjects in which he was interested.

It is to be regretted that the Senator from New Mexico is not with us today. He was as familiar with all of the facts and details of the case as was any man on the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and probably more familiar.

As all Senators know, the Senator from New Mexico is ill, having been stricken some time ago, and later while he was recuperating he was the victim of an automobile accident and is again in the hospital. I know that it is the wish of every Member of the Senate that he may have an early and speedy recovery and

that he may soon return to his duties in this legislative body.

Continuing with the evidence, I find Mr. Brunk said:

I felt so strongly about it that I gave him \$56,800 for land I didn't see.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the point that I want to know more about.

Mr. BRUNK. That is it, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You explained to this committee that you sat out there and paid \$56,800 for land you never saw and didn't know anything about, and you have justified it because of your—what did you say?

Mr. BRUNK. I told this Senator this morning, Senator HATCH, that my motives couldn't be explained as simply as anyone thinks. I have no children. I have seen big corporations and chain banks become perfectly holy in their relationships to life, but the minute that some fellow sets out on an enterprise to represent my kind of people that weren't born on the right side of the tracks, then he is in trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. Why didn't you just give him a check for \$50,000 and say, "This is a donation"? Why go to all the subterfuge of buying the land?

Mr. President, that is what the Senator from New Mexico said. Now listen to this:

Mr. BRUNK. If I had been intelligent, I wouldn't have bought the land, and if I had been intelligent I wouldn't have gone to subterfuge, and if I were intelligent I wouldn't be here and he wouldn't be here arguing about the thing. All I can say is that I am that kind of a fellow. I have sued people without compensation because I thought they were in a conspiracy to eliminate a life-insurance company. I am that kind of a fellow. I don't claim to be rational about it.

Senator LUCAS. You are complaining bitterly about these big fellows; you have done pretty well for yourself?

Mr. BRUNK. Sure I did; I did so well that I put some of it back up there—

Back up where? Where did he get his money to begin with? He got it from the bond transactions in the State of North Dakota, over which Governor LANGER had a veto power, and he made so much money out of these bond transactions that he put some of it "back up there" into these real-estate transactions. In the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois, a more shameful episode has never taken place between one who was the Governor of a State and one who occupied the position of a bond salesman of county and State securities of North Dakota, as did both Brunk and Brewer in this case.

I did so well that I put some of it back up there, and I hope that I have helped, but it looks to me like I have hurt.

That is the testimony of Mr. Brunk.

At this point in the debate it seems to me to be pertinent to read into the RECORD some of the testimony of this eccentric Mr. Brunk, of Des Moines, Iowa. The following appears on page 206 of the record of the hearing:

Senator LUCAS. What arrangements did you have with Brewer as to the profit-and-loss situation in this arrangement?

Brewer was his bond partner.

Mr. BRUNK. My hopefulness at that time was that I would share in the profit and that there would not be any losses.

Senator LUCAS. Did it prove to be so?

Mr. BRUNK. He has proven to be the best client I have ever had—

Meaning Mr. Brewer—

as far as policy is concerned, and as far as consideration for what I believed to be my rights is concerned.

Senator LUCAS. Now, here is a photostatic copy that the investigators obtained when they were in Des Moines this summer, which is known as Corporation Sheet No. 1 and is headed "Attorneys' fees and commissions paid."

Mr. BRUNK. Do you want to keep those while I look at copies of them, Senator?

Senator LUCAS. If you will just identify this, as to whether it is not a true and correct photostatic copy?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes; it is.

Senator LUCAS. Mr. Reporter, mark this "Committee's Exhibit No. 3." (Committee's exhibit No. 3 was marked for identification.)

Senator LUCAS. The first item on this page is February 25, 1936?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes.

Senator LUCAS. And down in the middle of the page you will find a sum of \$610 payable to WILLIAM LANGER, which has been spoken of here.

Mr. BRUNK. Yes.

Senator LUCAS. By previous witnesses?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes.

Senator LUCAS. Just give the committee briefly what that was for?

Mr. BRUNK. I do not think I was in but one of the conferences, but I think I know what that \$610 was for, if you want hearsay with reference to it.

Senator LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BRUNK. There was an appointee of the Senator that was on the workmen's compensation board.

By that time the Morton County and Ward County transactions were to the point where Wells Dickey and Allison Williams and V. W. Brewer had bonds to sell.

He asked, I think, the ex-Governor, Mr. LANGER, to go up there and see this particular party and introduce him. I think, in addition to that, there were discussions of counties all around there—

Mr. President, I repeat that:

I think, in addition to that, there were discussions of counties all around there—

Remember, Senators, this was in the fall of 1936, just before Governor LANGER took office in 1937. If I am not mistaken, the Governor had been elected, but had not taken office, when this \$610 had been paid on the Morton County bonds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the record further show that most of the work leading to those bond transactions had also been done prior to Governor LANGER taking the oath of office?

Mr. LUCAS. I will come to that, and whether it was or was not does not have any bearing on the position I take on this transaction.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not the answer I intended to elicit from the Senator from Illinois. In other words, I do not believe that his answer is responsive to my question.

Mr. LUCAS. We have read that report into the record, and we have shown that these gentlemen did yeoman service in the reorganization of the fiscal structure of the various counties in North Dakota in 1936, 1937, and 1938.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that the Senator will also refer to the report that was made by order of Governor Moses, who succeeded Governor LANGER, and I do not believe, as I recall, that that report reflects any fraud of any kind practiced by Governor LANGER in connection with any of the bond deals.

Mr. LUCAS. If I do not show that, I am certain the Senator from Louisiana will.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President; I think the Senator ought to do it for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator in the beginning that I am going to read this record, and I should like to proceed as rapidly as possible with it, because we have a long record. I do not desire to refuse to yield, but I shall be forced to do so if interruption continues. I wish to get through with the record, and I suggest that the Senator make notes as I go along, and when I have concluded ask me for any information he desires. What I am reading here does not have any connection with what the Senator has asked me. His question refers to another point. Consequently I do not wish to be diverted from the subject, and from the point I am trying to make now. If the Senator will bear with me on that point, I shall appreciate it very much.

I am reading from page 207 of the hearings:

I think, in addition to that, there were discussions of counties all around there and the people to see and talk to and who were in relationship to all these various factions, without which you could not deal in any county.

I think there was a time charge of \$610 for that service.

Senator LUCAS. You think the fee that was paid to the Senator at that time was fair and reasonable and that he earned the money?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes; I think it is the cheapest service Mr. Brewer has paid for up there.

Senator LUCAS. That is especially true in view of the profits made later on?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes, sir. I think it is the cheapest fee paid.

Senator LUCAS. Now, right below that is an item of \$200—

I may say to Senators who are following the reading, that I was pointing to a ledger sheet which had been lifted from the original ledger sheet of Mr. Brunk himself, which sheet was introduced and is part of the record here. In other words, we are talking about his own records. They had an account they called an expense and an entertainment account, which shows that thousands and thousands of dollars were paid out, and what I am now reading was a part of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Not just now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Senator from Illinois refused to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I wish to ask pertains to what the Senator is now talking about.

Mr. LUCAS. I am going on with this matter now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. I continue to read:



Senator LUCAS. Now, right below that is an item of \$200 to Hugh McCulloch and another item of \$150 to Hugh McCulloch and another item of \$200 to Hugh McCulloch; and another one of \$250 to Hugh McCulloch on April 28; another one, April 28, Hugh McCulloch, \$750. Do you know anything about what those commissions were for?

Mr. BRUNK. No; I do not, but I can tell you what I think they were for.

Senator LUCAS. Well, you have talked to Brewer about the money that he paid out to Mr. McCulloch, of course?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes.

Senator LUCAS. And I think it is fair, while probably not proper, to have your views upon that subject.

Mr. BRUNK. Well, I think this whole list in here was predicated upon this type of concept that I have had.

I think that, first, you have to have a place where a reasonable service can be performed before you have a right to talk to anybody.

Second, you have to talk to the people that can contract with you to let you perform that service.

Third, you have to have people associated with you that can perform the service.

Fourth, you have to keep everybody else in agreement with you; that will not upset you while you are trying to do it.

There is more testimony following but it is not on this line of thought. I am now going to turn to another page wherein we find analogous examples of pure bribery. What I am attempting to show to the Senate at this particular time is the amount of fees paid by Brunk and this fellow Brewer to different individuals up there who had a nuisance value, so to speak, in order to get them out of the way. In other words they bought their way through, if necessary and I will prove that by Brunk's own testimony. That is what he has reference to in his statement:

Fourth, you have to keep everybody else in agreement with you, that will not upset you while you are trying to do it.

On page 219 of the hearings the same type of examination continues. I read from Mr. Brunk's testimony:

Senator LUCAS. From this exhibit—

I am still discussing the same exhibit that was produced from the records of Mr. Brunk—

From this exhibit I notice on September 8 you paid a fellow by the name of L. M. Peet—

It must be remembered that this is money which is being paid by Brunk and Brewer to these chisellers in 1937, when they are dealing with these various bond issues in the State of North Dakota.

What was that for, and who is Peet?

Mr. BRUNK. L. M. Peet is the vice president of the Farmers' Union Life Insurance Co.

Senator LUCAS. What was that paid for?

Mr. BRUNK. He and Mr. Brewer had a deal in relation to some counties in North Dakota, and what it was paid for I don't know, in relationship to counties, but I know that it was paid for in relationship to service.

Senator LUCAS. What was it paid for in relationship to service; what did he do?

Mr. BRUNK. That classified in my definition, or the definition to me, as promotion.

Senator LUCAS. Promotion?

Mr. BRUNK. That is right.

Senator LUCAS. Is he one of the fellows that you had to get with you before you could make the deal, as you explained this morning?

Mr. BRUNK. No; he wouldn't classify to my mind on that basis.

Senator LUCAS. As that type of a fellow?

Mr. BRUNK. No.

Senator LUCAS. All right. You also paid L. M. Peet on October 28 another \$1,000—was that for the same type of service?

Mr. BRUNK. That is right.

Senator LUCAS. Then you also—

Mr. BRUNK (interposing). Are you looking at the October 6 item, Senator?

Senator LUCAS. Oh, you paid him \$900 on October 6, and then you paid Peet, on October 28, another \$1,000.

Mr. BRUNK. That is right.

Senator LUCAS. And you are not just sure what Peet did for that?

Mr. BRUNK. I never thought he did anything. I thought he chiseled.

This is to lay the foundation on which to show what they were doing in North Dakota—these high-powered, dignified, clean-cut bond salesmen who paid out \$1,800 to a man because, as he said, they "chiseled us out of it." They were willing to pay a chiseler \$1,800 in order to help put this bond deal over in North Dakota—pay it to a man for doing nothing.

Mr. BRUNK. Yes; I think he was one of these fellows who set himself up as a nuisance value and you weren't sure whether you had it or not.

Senator LUCAS. Well, he was dealing with some pretty smart fellows—

Mr. BRUNK (interposing). The only thing I think was smart about the transaction is that when you just resent a man it doesn't do any good to resent him.

In other words, do not resent him if you have a big deal on. Pay, in order finally to get him out of the way, whether he renders any service or not. That is exactly what Mr. Brunk meant.

Senator LUCAS. How about John M. Holzworth. On November 10, 1938, you paid him \$1,000. Who is he and what did he do for that?

Mr. BRUNK. He sold \$1,000 worth of his books on the Fighting Governor to Mr. Brewer.

Senator LUCAS. He sold \$1,000 worth of books to Brewer on the Fighting Governor?

Mr. BRUNK. Right.

Senator LUCAS. Who was the Fighting Governor?

Mr. BRUNK. The subject matter of the book was about his old classmate WILLIAM LANGER, of Columbia.

Senator LUCAS. And Mr. Brewer fell for \$1,000 worth of those books?

Mr. BRUNK. That is right. I don't like the word "fell."

Senator LUCAS. You said that he sold him, that he sold Brewer \$1,000 worth of books?

Mr. BRUNK. That is right.

Senator LUCAS. Do you think he would have sold Brewer \$1,000 worth of books on the Fighting Governor from Montana?

Mr. BRUNK. No; I don't think he could have done it on the Fighting Governor from Montana.

Not a chance. A thousand dollars for books goes from Brewer to the book salesman, for the book on the Fighting Governor of North Dakota. There was not a chance to sell a book on the Fighting Governor of Illinois, or the Fighting Governor of Louisiana.

Mr. President, I am laying out a pattern. I am attempting to tell the Senate what those bond salesmen did in laying a foundation in North Dakota to get into their hands the cream of the crop so far as county bonds were concerned, in

order that they might in 2 years make \$300,000 in gross profits. They were ruthless. I saw them both on the witness stand. Listen to the next glaring example of chicanery and fraud.

Senator LUCAS. Now, you also have an item here on December 31, 1938, of J. J. Shambaugh, where you paid him \$1,225 as a commission. Who is Shambaugh?

Mr. BRUNK. Shambaugh was president of the Royal Union Life Insurance Co., who came to me on the Royal Union loan, and when it went into receivership I appreciated the \$37,500 fee that had come out of the deal, and when he got out of a job down in Davenport where he was an examiner in charge of an insurance trust, and when no other insurance company would hire him, I put him in the office and he called on Iowa insurance companies to try to sell them bonds.

Senator LUCAS. That had nothing to do with the North Dakota bond deal?

Mr. BRUNK. Nothing whatever.

Senator LUCAS. And is that true with respect to the item that was paid out, of \$1,200, to Shambaugh at a later date?

Mr. BRUNK. Yes, sir. The exact explanation of that is 12 months at \$100 a month in each case.

Senator LUCAS. You paid him \$100 a month for 12 months?

Mr. BRUNK. In each case; that is right.

Senator LUCAS. Weren't there some bonds bought at that time in Shambaugh's name?

Mr. BRUNK. Shambaugh sold, I think, in his entire experience, 10 bonds, and 10 bonds were bought from Brewer and sold and delivered in Shambaugh's name to somebody—

Senator LUCAS (interposing). Why was that?

Mr. BRUNK. Well, it was his customer, and he sold them.

Senator LUCAS. You mean Shambaugh—

Mr. BRUNK (interposing). I think what you are asking about—and we can go faster on this—I think there were some bonds delivered later to institutions in North Dakota when Governor Moses was Governor, and the name Brewer had achieved so much distaste up there that he preferred they be delivered in another name, and I think Shambaugh was a dummy in that transaction.

That is Brunk's testimony. Brewer's name had achieved so much disrepute in the State of North Dakota that he and Brunk decided to deliver bonds under another name during Governor Moses' reign. Instead of delivering the bonds under the name of Brewer they delivered them under the name of Shambaugh. I do not care whether the amount was \$100 or \$100,000. It is the principle of the thing. Yet we are told that those bond salesmen in North Dakota, Mr. Brunk and Mr. Brewer, were the acme of purity in all these transactions, and that nothing was wrong.

Senator LUCAS. How many bonds were delivered in the name of Shambaugh as a dummy transaction?

Mr. BRUNK. I can't give you that, but I don't believe it was over 100 bonds.

Senator LUCAS. Why did Brewer do that?

Mr. BRUNK. Because the name Brewer had had plenty of publicity and they didn't want the name on the records.

The name of Brewer had had plenty of publicity? What kind of publicity would cause a man not to want to have his own name go on the records in the banks of North Dakota?

Senator LUCAS. On this same sheet there is also an item of \$300 on June 19, paid to C. L. Lewis; and on July 10 an item of \$300

paid to C. L. Lewis; and on September 22, an item to C. L. Lewis of \$250; and on September 14, an item to C. L. Lewis in the sum of \$1,100. Do you know Lewis?

Mr. BRUNK. I have never met Mr. Lewis, but I think I know who Mr. Lewis is. He was a brother-in-law of Gronna, he had been fired by Governor LANGER, and he was out of work and was helping Brewer.

Senator LUCAS. What did Brewer tell you that Lewis was doing?

Mr. BRUNK. Going out and getting together with county commissioners and introducing Brewer.

Senator LUCAS. And Lewis was a brother-in-law of Gronna, who had been fired by Governor LANGER?

Mr. BRUNK. As I understand the story. Senator LUCAS. But Lewis and Mr. LANGER were friendly?

Mr. BRUNK. I don't know that.

Mr. MURPHY. Senator, it was Lewis who was fired, and not Gronna.

Senator LUCAS. Lewis was fired by Governor LANGER?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; not Gronna.

Senator LUCAS. I see.

Now, there is an item here of \$5,000 to John Sullivan. Do you know John Sullivan?

Mr. BRUNK. I never have met him, but I know who he is.

Senator LUCAS. He is a lawyer in that section that did a lot of work for Mr. Brewer in connection with the reconstruction of the fiscal structure?

Mr. BRUNK. Right; he was in those deals in Morton County, the very first one and the later ones, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Those were strictly legal fees?

Mr. BRUNK. I rate them in the same relationship as the others.

The amounts which Sullivan received were not legal fees.

Mr. BRUNK. I rate them in the same relationship as the others. I think you can't deal very much in Morton County without consulting him. He had a taxpayers' league and everything else. He is a representative of the taxpayers' association, an attorney for all the railroads.

Senator LUCAS (interposing). Now let me ask you this. What do your records show as to the total amount of money that the Brewer Co. made while Senator LANGER was Governor of North Dakota during the years 1937 and 1938? Make a recapitulation and show that.

Before I proceed further, let me say that I introduce this line of testimony on the part of Gregory Brunk himself to show that in the beginning he paid thousands of dollars to individuals in various counties simply to buy them, in order to get in. That was all there was to it. Brewer and Brunk simply bought those people in order to get hold of the bonds.

I now return to page 74 of the committee report, and continue to read:

Your committee further represents that there were \$6,200 delinquent taxes against said property (see p. 590) when it was purchased by Brunk, and that he had made no effort to pay them up to the time of the hearing. Your committee further represents that there were mortgages against this property, one of which had been foreclosed, and at the hearing Gregory Brunk said that while it was his understanding that the respondent would take care of these mortgages and all claims of indebtedness against the land, that if respondent did not meet the obligations Brunk would. The evidence shows that there was \$30,200 in liens against said land.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves the question of the activities of Brunk?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure that the Senator believes that the testimony pretty clearly indicates that bribery was going on in Brunk's relations with Senator LANGER. I note that the testimony was taken about November 1, or the first week in November of 1941. I have gathered from the proceedings that the present administration in North Dakota is unfriendly to Senator LANGER. Is that true?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether I am qualified to reach a conclusion on that point. Governor Moses is a Democrat.

Mr. BROWN. It seems to me that the testimony which was adduced at the hearing is sufficient to cause the authorities in North Dakota to investigate the activities of Brunk. I want to know whether anything of that kind has been done, to the knowledge of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say by way of brief explanation of the point the Senator has raised that what happened was that a man by the name of Duffey was appointed by Governor Moses to make an investigation of the bond situation; and the investigation is partially included in the report. But Duffey never scratched the surface so far as obtaining what we obtained. Duffey had no power to go outside the State of North Dakota, and go into Des Moines, Iowa, to find out what Brunk did in Des Moines. Neither did he have any power to go into Minneapolis, Minn., where Mr. Brewer lived, and make such an investigation. The evidence obtained when the investigators interviewed Mr. Brunk in his office in Des Moines, Iowa, some time last summer, was the first evidence that anyone in North Dakota or anyone else ever obtained insofar as the details of the transaction are concerned.

In the campaign questions were raised about this bond issue and that bond issue. I think Lemke raised such questions, and I think that many general charges were made that the counties had been robbed and that someone had made a lot of money on the bond issues, and so forth and so on. But I challenge anyone to show from any newspaper or from any record that the details of the bond transaction, including the sale of real estate, ever were discussed in North Dakota.

The Governor of North Dakota and Mr. Duffey, the special tax man he appointed to make the investigations, know all about the matter. Duffey testified down there before our committee, and he and the Governor know exactly what has happened.

Mr. BROWN. Is he the attorney general of North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think he is the attorney general; I think he is the special attorney who was appointed by Governor Moses to make the investigation.

I do not know whether the statute of limitations has run upon the transaction or not.

Mr. BROWN. I was about to ask the Senator if he knows whether there is a statute of limitations which would run against a criminal prosecution based upon the facts which are set forth in the testimony.

Mr. LUCAS. That I cannot tell. Those matters occurred in 1937 and 1938, and this is 1942. Whether North Dakota has a 5-year or 10-year statute of limitations I simply do not know.

At any rate, that is the explanation. Without some authority from a Federal source of some kind, without the power to subpoena books and records, as was done in this case, no individual in the State of North Dakota ever would have the right—as the Senator well knows—to go into another State and make such an investigation.

Before I proceed to discuss other matters, I want to return to the bond transaction, because it is important. In the minority report the argument is made and the position is taken that in 1937 and 1938 the Governor of the State of North Dakota never had a single thing to do with any of these county bond issues, and that he never talked to any of the county commissioners, with the exception of the commissioners of the one county of Divide. That may be true. But all the way through in this argument it must be remembered that in 1937 there was reenacted a law providing that no county bonds could be sold to the State Bank of North Dakota or to any other financial institution of that State, such as the agricultural college, and so forth, unless the matter was first passed on by the industrial commission, of which the Governor of the State was chairman; and of course the Governor had veto power over everything done by the State Bank of North Dakota. It must also be remembered in connection with this matter that Mr. Vogel, who at that time was, and still is, head of the State Bank of North Dakota, had been the lifelong political friend of Governor LANGER. They were indicted together in the co-conspiracy case. They still are friends; they still are close, and have been all these years. Vogel was the fellow who in 1937 was put in by Governor LANGER to head the bank; and he replaced a Mr. Stangler, who had been there for a long time. He appeared before our committee, and he made an impression upon me. But Mr. Vogel did not come down; he was not subpoenaed, and for some reason the opposition did not subpoena him. The record shows that Vogel had been a small banker up at Cold Harbor, N. Dak., and his bank went down with the crash. Senator LANGER, when he became Governor, placed Vogel in the vital position of head of the Bank of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would be unfair to Senator LANGER to leave the statement just made by the Senator



from Illinois without the further statement that Mr. Stangler—of whom the majority speak with a great deal of respect in their report, and of whom the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] now speaks with a great deal of respect—was kept in the bank under Mr. Vogel, was called as a witness before our committee, and his testimony from beginning to end shows—if I read it correctly—that the business of the bank, and especially with the county commissioners, was carried on through him, and, so far as he knew, there never was anything irregular.

If the Senator will yield further—  
Mr. LUCAS. I shall not yield now if the Senator wishes to make a long speech; I cannot yield now for that purpose.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not intend to make a long speech. I simply wish to make a further observation.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to say that, in my opinion, every Member of the Senate, before he renders his decision in the pending matter, should read the complete evidence of Brewer, of Spangler, and of Mr. Duffy, who made the investigation for Governor Moses of the State of North Dakota, and should get from the record the true picture of the bond transactions.

Mr. LUCAS. That certainly will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it should be done.

Mr. LUCAS. It certainly will be satisfactory to me to have Senators read those records and read Mr. Brunk's testimony. The Senator from Utah would also include Mr. Brunk's testimony in his request, would he not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I would include Mr. Brunk's testimony.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I think that should be read, by all means.

Mr. MURDOCK. But, in order to find out what the bond transactions were, I think that all Members of the Senate should be sure to read the testimony of Duffy, of Spangler, the man who investigated for the Governor, and of the other man who ran the bank as assistant to Mr. Vogel.

Mr. LUCAS. Now I desire to return to the matter of the bond transactions, and to discuss it in a little more detail, because I think it is important.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not yield for the moment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. In the course of the hearings, Senator LANGER testified that no single instance could be shown in which he interfered with the county commissioners in bond transactions; and that is part of the argument of counsel that was made before your committee. I think what the Senator had reference to was insofar as dealing with any of the county bonds that were taken over by Brunk and Brewer. Insofar as that statement is concerned, he is absolutely correct; he had no dealing, so far as the record shows, with any of the county commis-

sioners, in attempting to get them to do what they did in the selling of the bonds to the State Bank of North Dakota. It was not necessary for him to do so, and he did not do so.

But I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the power that the Governor of the State of North Dakota has over the county commissioners and the State's attorney of each county. It is almost unbelievable that the Governor should have the power to suspend the State's attorney of a county—an official who is elected by the people. But in North Dakota the Governor does have such power; and it was rather an interesting legal proposition to me when I came across it, because I had never before heard of anything of that sort.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an important case involving the County Commissioners of Williams County. In June 1937, when Mr. Brewer and Mr. Brunk were doing a land-office business with all the county bonds in that county, Williams County sold \$145,000 of bonds to H. E. Mueller. Immediately thereafter a petition was filed with the Governor of North Dakota by certain citizens of that county asking that the commissioners of the county, as well as the State's attorney, who was authorized and directed under the law to pass upon the legality of the bond issues, be removed from office. I desire to read just a little of the petition that was filed.

It was filed by a man by the name of Roy Frazier, who was a close political friend of Governor LANGER, and was constantly in the witness room during the hearings, so I am told; he was called as a witness but never was used as a witness. Frazier is the fellow, along with two or three or four others, who signed this petition; and it presents a bit of interesting reading as to what Mr. Burk, the State's attorney who was suspended by the Governor, said about the whole proceeding.

Here was Mueller, who was independent of Brunk and Brewer, and who bought \$145,000 worth of bonds. Then the petition was filed by certain citizens, in which they say in the prayer:

Wherefore we, as plaintiffs and your relatives, do hereby pray and petition that you, as Governor and chief executive of the State of North Dakota, accept and file this petition and complaint, together with copies thereof; and that you serve or cause to be served on the defendants and each of them a notice of the time and place of taking testimony set or to be set by you; and that you name a special commissioner, before whom any and all evidence shall be taken and proceedings shall be had according to law; that you authorize and direct the attorney general of the State of North Dakota to prosecute such hearing and that you designate a competent attorney as special counsel to appear on behalf of and prosecute these proceedings for the State of North Dakota; and that you take any and all other necessary steps and proceedings contemplated hereby and required by law; and we do hereby especially petition and request that you audit or cause to be audited and investigate any and all books, records, and proceedings relating to matters herein complained of, including any and all other wrongful acts and misconducts which may come to your attention through such investigation committed by the defendants or each of them named herein, and that this petition be in all things granted to the end that the defendants and each and all of them be removed from his office of county

commissioner in and for said Williams County, and such other and further relief as you may deem just, proper, and lawful in this proceeding.

Among other charges made was that the State's attorney was not only ignorant of the law but was doing wrong in connection with the approval of the bonds; and they also charge, I believe, among other things, that he had not done his duty as State's attorney. So a gentleman was appointed in accordance with the prayer of the petition to take the testimony. I wish to put in the Record the meat of the charge found in the second paragraph:

That at said time and place these defendants, as such members of the Board of County Commissioners of the said Williams County, individually and as such members, initiated, introduced, and considered a resolution authorizing the issuance of bonds of the said Williams County in the sum of \$145,000, to bear interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum, payable semiannually, and by the terms of such resolution stipulated and agreed that one H. E. Mueller, of Hazen, N. Dak., become the purchaser of such bonds, and that such purchaser should and would pay a price for the proposed bonds so that he would net a commission to himself of three-fourths percent on the total amount of such bonds; that on June 8, 1937, the defendants, as members of the said board, voted in favor of aid, and did then and there pass such resolution.

Then paragraph 4 of the petition states:

That the undersigned complainants are informed and understand, and therefore allege on information and belief, that the defendants, as members of the Board of County Commissioners of said Williams County, did not advertise or cause to be advertised for bids for the sale of the bonds herein mentioned, and that the said defendants did willfully, wrongfully, and negligently did not offer or attempt to offer to sell said bonds to any bank, bond or State agency of the State of North Dakota authorized by law to purchase the said bonds, and willfully, wrongfully failed to sell or offer to sell such bonds to any person, firm, or corporation within or without the State which were engaged in the business of buying and selling such bonds.

And so forth. The chief complaint in that was that they failed to attempt to sell the bonds to the State of North Dakota, which, under the law, they should have done. As the result of this transaction, as a result of the charges against the State's attorney, the matter was referred to a commissioner to take the proof. Governor LANGER appointed a commissioner by the name of Halpern to take the proof, and, under the petition, suspended all the officers of the county during that time, including the State's attorney of the county and every member of the county board.

Then, what happened? I wish to read the testimony of Walter Burk.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just for an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was about to suggest to the Senator that it might be well to put the entire petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I will be glad to do that, and I ask unanimous consent that the petition from which I just read be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The petition is as follows:

Before the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Governor of the State of North Dakota—State of North Dakota ex rel. plaintiffs and petitioners, against J. M. Swanson, George Eckblad, Adolph Olson, H. P. Overland, defendants—complaint and petition for removal of public officers by the Governor.

To HIS EXCELLENCY, WILLIAM LANGER, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA:

We as resident citizens and qualified electors in and for Williams County in the State of North Dakota in the name and by authority of the State of North Dakota do hereby, and herein respectfully complain and inform your excellency, the Governor and chief executive of this State of North Dakota, that is to say, the aforesaid-named defendants are and were guilty of misconduct, malfeasance, neglect of duty, and misconduct while in office as commissioners and members of the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, said State, that is to say:

1. That at all times and dates, from and after the first Monday in January 1937 and on this date the hereinbefore-named defendants, J. M. Swanson, George Eckblad, Adolph Olson, and H. P. Overland, have been and now are the duly elected, qualified, and acting members of the Board of County Commissioners in and for Williams County, State of North Dakota, which county during all of the time herein mentioned was and is a regularly organized county within this State and that the defendants herein named were acting and did act as its board of county commissioners charged with all of the duties imposed by the laws of North Dakota on members of such commissioners while and when acting in such official capacity.

2. That between the first Monday of January 1937 and this 26th day of March 1938, and particularly on or about the 8th day of June 1937 the defendants herein named and each of them have been and now are guilty of misfeasance, malfeasance, misconduct in office, neglect of duty in the office of members of the Board of County Commissioners in and for Williams County, N. Dak., in that on or about the 8th day of June 1937, at a regularly called and constituted meeting of the Board of County Commissioners of said Williams County of which board these defendants were and did act as members, had under consideration the sale of approximately \$145,000 of bonds as a bond issue of the said Williams County, which bond issue was then and there to be issued and sold as obligations of said Williams County for the purpose of raising funds for said county to take up and refund outstanding and existing indebtedness of the said county created and existing as an obligation of said county prior to January 1, 1937; that at said time and place these defendants, as such members of the Board of County Commissioners of the said Williams County, individually and as such members, initiated, introduced, and considered a resolution authorizing the issuance of bonds of the said Williams County in the sum of \$145,000 to bear interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum, payable semiannually and by the terms of said resolution stipulated and agreed that one H. E. Mueller, of Hazen, N. Dak., become the purchaser of such bonds and that such purchaser should and would pay a price for the proposed bonds so that he would net a commission to himself of three-fourths of 1 percent on the total amount of such bonds; that on June 8, 1937, the defendants, as members of the said board, voted in favor of aid and did then and there pass such resolution, which reso-

lution is herein set out by copy attached hereto marked "Exhibit B" and by such exhibit made a part of this complaint and petition as those herein fully recited.

3. That your petitioners are informed and believe, and allege on information and belief, that all of the defendants attended the said meeting of the Board of County Commissioners on June 8, 1937, and each in his official capacity considered and voted in favor of the passing of such resolution and entered the same as a part and portion of the official records of such meeting, and each of the said defendants thereafter considered and approved such official minutes of their said meeting, thereby made the same effective and binding on said Williams County.

4. That the undersigned complainants are informed and understand and therefore allege on information and belief that the defendants as members of the Board of County Commissioners of said Williams County did not advertise nor cause to be advertised for bids for the sale of the bonds herein mentioned, and that the said defendants willfully, wrongfully, and negligently did not offer nor attempt to offer to sell said bonds to any bank, bond, or State agency of the State of North Dakota authorized by law to purchase the said bonds and willfully, wrongfully failed to sell or offer to sell such bonds to any person, firm, or corporation within or without the State which were engaged in the business of buying and selling such bonds, but on the other hand the defendants willfully, wrongfully, unlawfully, and negligently acting and proceeded in accordance with the resolution herein set forth and referred to; and that the said defendants knew or should have known that their acts, as set forth in the resolution herein referred to as exhibit "B," and all other proceedings taken and had by them relating to the negotiations of the sale of the said bonds was binding on said Williams County and permitted the purchaser, contemplated by such resolution, to avoid his part of the agreement at any time before the contemplated transaction was entirely completed; and that by reason of such willful, wrongful, and negligent acts of the defendants the said county of Williams and the citizens and taxpayers therein have lost and will lose large sums of money to the wrong and detriment of the said county and its taxpayers all by reason of the willful, wrongful, careless, and negligent acts of the defendants and each of them relating to the bond transaction herein mentioned and set forth.

5. The undersigned complainants allege that Walter O. Burk was at all times during the bond transaction, herein complained of, the duly appointed, qualified, and acting State's attorney in and for said Williams County, and was during the bond transaction, herein complained of, the legal adviser of the defendants as members of the board of county commissioners, and knew, or should have known, all of the acts and transactions had and done by the defendants as county commissioners, and by reason thereof your complainants allege on information and belief that all of the acts and proceedings of the defendants as members of the board of county commissioners was had and done with the full knowledge, consent, and approval of the said Walter O. Burk as State's attorney in and for said Williams County, and by reason thereof we allege that he is not the proper person to investigate nor prosecute the charges made in this complaint.

6. That this proceeding is brought by these plaintiffs as petitioners in the name of the State of North Dakota upon the relationship of these plaintiffs and as authorized and provided by law and particularly under the provisions of sections Nos. 683 to 696 of the Compiled Laws of the State of North Dakota for 1913, and any and all amendments thereto.

Wherefore we as plaintiffs and your relators do hereby pray and petition that you as Governor and Chief Executive of the State of

North Dakota accept and file this petition and complaint, together with copies thereof, and that you serve or cause to be served on the defendants and each of them a notice of the time and place of taking testimony set out to be set by you; and that you name a special commissioner before whom any and all evidence shall be taken and proceedings shall be had according to law; that you authorize and direct the attorney general of the State of North Dakota to prosecute such hearing and that you designate a competent attorney as special counsel to appear on behalf of and prosecute these proceedings for the State of North Dakota; and that you take any and all other necessary steps and proceedings contemplated hereby and required by law; and we do hereby especially petition and request that you audit or cause to be audited and investigate any and all books, records, and proceedings relating to matters herein complained of, including any and all other wrongful acts and misdoings which may come to your attention through such investigation committed by the defendants or each of them named herein, and that this petition be in all things granted to the end that the defendants and each and all of them be removed from his office of county commissioner in and for said Williams County and such other and further relief as you may deem just, proper, and lawful in this proceeding.

Dated at Williston, N. Dak., this 26th day of March 1938.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have just offered for the RECORD the petition in the case involving the county commissioners and the State's attorney. After the verified petition was filed, Governor LANGER, on the 29th of March 1938, issued an order, as follows:

A verified petition having been filed with the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Governor of the State of North Dakota, alleging certain irregularities on the part of the above-named county commissioners of Williams County, and the Governor, after a careful consideration of such charges and believing they constituted grounds for removal, if true, thereupon suspended said commissioners from office and appointed Saul Halpern, Esq., of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., to act as special commissioner to take and report the testimony in a hearing to be had before said commissioner commencing at 10 a. m., on the 18th day of April 1938, in the courtroom of the Williams County Courthouse, at Williston, N. Dak., and upon the conclusion thereof to report such testimony to the Governor in the manner provided by law, and the said Saul Halpern having accepted such appointment and having filed his oath of office, and all summary proceedings having been disposed of, the hearing in the above matter was called to order by Special Commissioner Halpern, at the time and place stated in such notice at which time William G. Owens, special assistant attorney general, appeared on behalf of the plaintiffs and the defendants being also present in person and by their attorney, Ivan V. Metzger, of Williston, N. Dak., and being ready to proceed, the following proceedings were thereupon had:

At 10 a. m., April 18, 1938, the hearing was called to order in the courtroom of the Williams County Courthouse at Williston, N. Dak., by Special Commissioner Saul Halpern.

By the COMMISSIONER. At this time, for the record, I will file my appointment and oath of office, and I believe it will also be necessary to swear the reporter.

Then followed the appointment of the commissioner:

#### APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER

I, WILLIAM LANGER, Governor of the State of North Dakota, do hereby appoint Attorney Saul Halpern of Glen Ullin, N. Dak., as



special commissioner to take and report testimony to be received by him at the hearing upon the complaint and petition filed with me for the removal from office of J. M. Seanson, George Eckblad, Adolph Olson, and H. F. Overland, as members of the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, N. Dak., and to report the same to me as provided by law.

Dated this 29th day of March, 1938.

WILLIAM LANGER,

Governor of the State of North Dakota.

By reference to the next page we find that on March 29 the Governor appointed a special prosecutor, and the proceedings followed. They are quite lengthy proceedings, and after the testimony was taken the respondents were found guilty by Governor LANGER, and were suspended. An appeal was taken by the State's attorney of the county, who was suspended along with the commissioners. He took an appeal, and I wish to read Burk's testimony into the record, which will be found at page 620 of volume 1 of the investigators' report.

Walter Burk was the State's attorney of the county, who was suspended by Governor LANGER as the result of his misdeeds in connection with the issuance of the bonds and their sale to this man Mueller. This is the testimony of Burk:

Walter Burke, called as a witness by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as follows:

Mr. Hoop. Please state your name.

Answer. Walter O. Burke.

Question. Your address.

Answer. Williston, N. Dak.

Question. Your age?

Answer. Thirty-nine.

Question. And how long have you resided here?

Answer. Since January 1928.

Question. And what political offices have you held?

Answer. From August 29 to January 1, 1933, I was the assistant State's attorney of Williams County. From the first part of January 1933, to December 31, 1938, I was State's attorney of Williams County, N. Dak.

Question. Now, then, during your term of office as State's attorney of Williams County, did Williams County let certain bonds, or make a bond issue.

Answer. There were several bond issues.

Question. Particularly was there a bond issue in 1937 and 1938?

Answer. There was one in 1937.

Question. And what was the amount of that bond issue, if you recall?

Answer. I don't recall the exact amount; it was in excess of \$100,000, according to my best recollection.

Question. And to whom was that bond issue sold?

Answer. H. E. Mueller, of Hazen, N. Dak.

Question. And do you recall what commission was allowed Mr. Mueller, or what price that particular bond issue was sold at?

Answer. I do not. I took no part in the proceedings in that bond issue.

Question. Well, do you recall that there was a discount allowed, or a commission allowed, Mr. Mueller?

Answer. I understand there was.

Question. And do you know whether or not prior to that time, prior to the time the bonds were sold to Mr. Mueller, that is the 1937 issue, that the Commissioners or someone representing Williams County had been to the Bank of North Dakota or to the other State agencies and had made an effort to

sell the bonds to the Bank of North Dakota or other State departments?

Answer. I understand that no effort was made on that particular bond issue.

Question. You understand that no effort was made?

Did you have anything to do with the sale of the bond issue of 1937?

Answer. I did not.

Question. That was handled by whom?

Answer. That was handled between H. E. Mueller, the County Commissioners and the County Auditor of Williams County, according to the information that these people have given me.

Question. Do you know whether or not Mr. Mueller shortly after he bought this issue sold them to some of the State Departments or to the Bank of North Dakota?

Answer. I don't know definitely. I understand he disposed of those in the Twin Cities.

Question. Now, then, did you have filed against you in 1937 or 1938 a petition or a complaint to remove you from office?

Answer. I did.

Question. Do you recall the date that the complaint was originally filed?

Answer. The complaint was served on me on April 1, 1938.

Question. Do you have a copy of that complaint?

Answer. No; the—my copies were submitted to Judge Lowe in substitution of the file which was missing from the Governor's office.

Question. That would be available from Judge Lowe in Minot?

Answer. Either there or—unless he has returned it to the District Court of Logan County.

Question. What is the county seat of Logan County?

Answer. Napoleon.

The entire proceedings would either be with Judge Lowe at Minot or with the clerk of the District Court of Logan County at Napoleon.

Question. Well, as briefly as possible state the substance of the complaint against you.

Answer. The original complaint was based entirely on the bond issue of 1937, which bonds were sold to H. E. Mueller. The complaint alleged that I had advised or should have advised the county commissioners with reference to this bond issue. The complaint alleged that the bonds had never been advertised for sale, and that no effort had been made to sell the bonds to any State department of the State of North Dakota before they were offered to H. E. Mueller.

Question. Did it also refer to the Bank of North Dakota and State department and the Bank of North Dakota, or did it just limit it to—

Answer (interrupting). My recollection is it referred to any departments or agencies of the State of North Dakota.

Question. Go ahead.

Answer. Before the date of the hearing an amended complaint was served on me which contained the allegations as to the bond issue, and also that I had commenced a certain garnishment action on behalf of the Williston Rural Credit Co. as plaintiff, and L. B. Doctorman, and in which Williams County was named as garnisher.

The complaint also charged that I, as State's attorney, had failed to do my duty in failing to punish the proprietor of a certain roadhouse located within Williams County.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading from the investigators' report, starting with page 620.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Am I to understand that this investigator went out and took an ex parte deposition?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and the Senator approved it, if he was here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I approved it, I did it without knowing what was contemplated, because I must say that in my familiarity and experience with Senate procedure I have never known of an investigator being permitted to go out and take an ex parte deposition.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator was not present, probably, when I went over this a day or so ago, but that is exactly what happened in this case. After a lengthy discussion in the committee, it was thought that investigators should be sent out, with the right on the part of both the petitioners and the respondent to give to the investigators the names of any witnesses they had.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I had understood that was merely the customary procedure followed in making a preliminary investigation. I did not understand the record was to be accepted in the Senate as evidence.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the purpose of sending out the investigators if we did not expect to use the testimony?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For the purpose of later developing it in a hearing by the Senate committee. I may be in error, but I have never in all my experience and familiarity with Senate practice or House practice heard of such a thing as sending out investigators to take an ex parte deposition which was later to be accepted as evidence.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I can say to the Senator—and I am not going to take any blame for it myself—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not blaming anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. This question has been raised two or three times, and if there is anyone to blame, it is the Senate of the United States itself. There was a long discussion about what we should do in connection with this matter, and we finally decided that the investigators should go out and take testimony like this I am reading. If we cannot avail ourselves of it, there was not very much use in taking it. I have known what the rule of law is with respect to ex parte hearings, just as well as the Senator from Missouri does, but I have never seen any rules of evidence observed in the Senate or in any committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not blaming anyone in this matter. If I voted for any such procedure, I must say I voted for it without being apprised of the facts, and without being familiar with them. I realize that the rules of evidence followed in a Senate committee are not the same as rules of evidence observed in a court of law, we all know that, but it seems to me that the purpose of a preliminary investigation by an investigator is to determine lines of investigation, not that the testimony so taken shall later be made a part of the record. I am not criticising the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator. If I voted for the procedure followed, I assume my share of the blame, but I do desire to state that I do not approve taking evidence in any such fashion.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I cannot control the views of Senators in this matter. It is one of the things we go into, and after going into it, and after long hearings, and someone trying to fulfill his duty, someone else rises and says, "No; I agreed to the original resolution, resolution 118, which gives the investigators power to go out and make this investigation, but I am not going to be bound by it." That is perfectly all right; I do not care whether the Senator is bound or not, but it does seem to me that we should consider the evidence, even though it is ex parte.

We took an affidavit, and letters and petitions, just plain letters and petitions and one affidavit, on the opening day of the session, and the Senate conferred jurisdiction upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections, without any verified matters, other than one affidavit, that of Jim Mulloy. Every one here on the opening day joined in conferring jurisdiction upon the Committee on Privileges and Elections to proceed and make the investigation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, that was simply part of the bill of complaint, which apparently presented a prima facie case for an investigation. That had nothing whatever to do with the procedure or the matter of the taking of evidence. I would vote against having an investigation of the subject without any hesitation.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but the Senator took it upon an ex parte proposition. Most of it was not sworn to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator just stated that there was an affidavit sworn to, which was in the nature of a bill of complaint.

Mr. LUCAS. When you obtain the affidavit look at the type of affidavit he made. You will find that it is not even an affidavit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not familiar with it. The Senator just stated it was an affidavit. At least it was sworn to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Missouri and also to the Senator from Illinois that at the time of the transaction referred to I happened to be chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. What caused us to take the course we took with reference to the matter was that the committee was anxious to avoid the necessity of sending a subcommittee out to the coast and having open hearings, and all the dramatics and things that go with it. We did not think it was practicable to bring all these witnesses to Washington and pay their expenses out of the Treasury. We had not had any authorization to do that. So we did authorize the investigators to examine witnesses and take their affidavits, and all that. But there never was any implication or any understanding that the Senate or the committee either one was bound, of course, by any of this stuff.

Mr. LUCAS. We are not bound by this now. No one is bound by it.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; not any more than we would be bound by a letter that might be introduced, or by a statement. It was done more to help us determine what the real issues were, and then when those issues were clarified in the minds of the members of the committee, if necessary the witnesses on those issues could be called before us to testify and be cross-examined. That was done in connection with some of these issues. We did have a hearing later on. We did not have all the witnesses before us, of course, but we had before us a number of witnesses who testified directly on what we thought was a pertinent issue.

I wish to advise the Senator from Missouri that there never was any intention, to my knowledge, on the part of the committee to bind in any way the subcommittee or the committee or the Senate or anyone else when it permitted the filing of these affidavits or the taking of these ex parte statements. So far as I know, the rules of evidence have never been strictly observed in any of these proceedings or hearings. If the affidavit does not seem credible, everyone is at liberty wholly to disregard it. Am I correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is precisely correct on the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is precisely correct. I wish to say in reply that there were lawyers on both sides of this case; it must be remembered that capable and competent counsel were employed on both sides. I should like for the Senator from Missouri to listen to this, if he will, because he is the one who raised the issue. Lawyers on both sides were employed. Former United States Senator Burke represented one side of the case, and former Senator Hardwick, of Georgia, represented the other side, together with a very fine lawyer by the name of Francis Murphy from Fargo. I think there were in all about eight attorneys engaged in the case.

I never saw so many lawyers sit around a trial table as sat around this table. They combed all the testimony. I can promise you that if there are any individuals who have read every line and every sentence in all the reports it is the lawyers on both sides of this case. They examined every bit of the testimony. They had the right, under the rule which we laid down, to cross-examine all the witnesses, and to produce any statement that had been found by the investigators, read it to the witnesses, and ask them whether it was true or false, or to cross-examine the witnesses in any way they desired.

In addition to that we gave the lawyers the right to subpoena any witnesses they wanted to subpoena or to have appear before the committee, and the taxpayers of the United States were paying the witness fees. That was what we did in order to protect every one involved in this matter.

I know that the affidavit I am reading is an ex parte affidavit, and no one has to accept it. It was taken under oath, but the witness was not cross-examined. Mr. President, doubtless the Senator from Missouri himself has been

chairman of a committee or subcommittee which held hearings and examined witnesses under a procedure whereby no one had an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses, and the examinations were ex parte, but were carried on by a United States Senator or Senators.

In order to avoid sending a committee to North Dakota to conduct hearings out there for 3 months—we talked the matter over at great length—in order that Senators could remain in Washington during the great emergency; we thought it best to follow this course of procedure.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] brought into the Senate, Senate Resolution 118, which was prepared by the legislative counsel, in line with his understanding, and the resolution was read to the committee, which unanimously agreed upon it. Under that resolution these investigators received the power to do what they have done in this case.

The briefs on behalf of both sides in this case have referred to testimony involved in these hearings which was prepared by the investigators the committee employed. In view of those circumstances, I thought I was in order in reading this affidavit into the RECORD, because it bears on the bond issue. This bond issue is the most important issue in the entire series of charges of moral turpitude. I do not care whether the testimony is ex parte or not. So long as it is under oath I am at least willing to examine it in order to determine, if I can, the motives and purposes behind this case, and to determine whether or not there is any relevancy in this bond transaction in Williams County, the county in which the Governor suspended all the commissioners, and the State's attorney, and caused the latter to appeal his case for reinstatement. The State's attorney finally was reinstated, but nothing was ever done about the county commissioners. The Governor went out of office, and after he went out of office the commissioners were all reelected and the bond issue was never invalidated. The State's attorney, however, was not reelected. He lost out by 125 votes.

I bring this matter in to show the Senate at least by an inference that when the county commissioners in Williams County, N. Dak., did not deal with Brewer and Brunk, the legal machinery of intimidation was started. Senators will find Mueller in other bond transactions after this one, dealing with Brewer and Brunk in North Dakota. He was a good boy after this transaction took place. That is the only reason I am reading this testimony.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As the Senator has referred to committee practice, and to myself, as having been a member of some committee, let me say that I have frequently been familiar with committees sending out investigators, but I have never been familiar with making anything part of the record which was not adduced before the committee itself. I realize, as I said a while ago, that the



committee practice in the Senate does not conform to the rules of evidence in a court of law, but I have never heard of the proposition before of making anything a part of the record which was not adduced before the committee itself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I can read a letter written to me by Governor Moses, of North Dakota, or I can read a letter from some citizen of North Dakota, and the Senator can either accept it for what it is worth or he can reject it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that, Mr. President, but the Senator from Illinois is referring to this ex parte deposition as a part of the record of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not question the right of the Senator from Illinois at all to give any credence he pleases to a postal card or to any sort of report that he has had from North Dakota. I simply say that so far as I am concerned I am not disposed to give credence, as a part of the evidence in this case, to a purely ex parte deposition.

Mr. LUCAS. That is entirely within the Senator's right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to everyone, it seems to me that entirely too much time is being taken up at this time with technical matters involving the procedure of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. We have been on the spot, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. And so far it has been difficult to determine whether the Senator from North Dakota or the committee is on trial.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may put it this way—whether the Senator from North Dakota or the Senator from Illinois is on trial.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois has been very courteous and considerate to everyone in this whole discussion. These remarks are without prejudice for or against anyone, just as the Senator from North Dakota was admitted to the Senate without prejudice. The situation resulting from these charges has not been precipitated by the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It was not precipitated by the Senate. It was precipitated by some of the people of North Dakota. They took the initiative here in bringing to the attention of the Senate, through me, certain charges against the Senator-elect from North Dakota. The Senator-elect could have been required to stand aside without taking the oath, on the basis of those charges, until the committee had investigated them. He was allowed to take his seat without prejudice, either against him or against the Senate, in the exercise of their respective rights. The Committee on Privileges and Elections was charged with the duty of investigating these charges, and I think the committee has done its duty conscientiously and industriously in an unpleasant and disagreeable situation.

We all know that all committees of the Senate, no matter what the procedure, assume greater latitude than would be permitted in a court of law. The rules of evidence are not required to be observed, and properly so. They cannot be observed in investigational matters which might lead to legislation or other official action by the Senate.

In a matter of this sort all the Senate desires to do is to arrive at the truth by whatever method it can arrive at it. I do not believe that Senators will make up their minds on the basis of some technical question as to whether the committee should have done this, that, or the other. The Senate is interested in arriving at the truth with respect not only to the charges, but all matters and circumstances pertaining to the qualification, suitability, and fitness of the Senator from North Dakota. Regarding that question I have not the slightest prejudice. It seems to me that the Senate ought not to be meticulous in undertaking to decide whether the committee, in the discharge of its duty as the agent of the Senate, and under the instructions of the Senate, observed or departed from the strict rules of evidence which would be applicable in a court of law or a court of equity. I think that in such proceedings the rules governing a court of equity are more applicable than those governing a court of law. We say that equity is the effort to correct the inequalities and injustices of the law itself.

Even beyond that question, a committee investigating a matter of this sort must seek to find the facts. Many Members of the Senate are lawyers. They know how to weigh testimony. They know what credit to give to it. I myself would not be prejudiced by an ex parte statement. Certainly, I would not make up my mind on the basis of an ex parte statement. I might even be induced to discount an ex parte statement which might be absolutely true, on the ground that the other side had not had an opportunity to cross-examine the witness who was giving the testimony or making the statement.

We have now been engaged for 4 days in the procedure on which we have embarked. Sometimes it seems as though the committee itself is under investigation and scrutiny to determine whether it pursued the right course in trying to ferret out the facts.

Many circumstances have been related, which constitute a chain of events. Taken separately, such circumstances might mean nothing, or taken altogether might mean much or nothing. All such circumstances together might not disqualify the Senator. Any given circumstance might not disqualify him. I think the Senate is able to draw the distinction and to make the proper discount and allowances. It seems to me that we ought not to devote too much time to the technical question of whether the committee, in any particular investigation, in the examination of certain witnesses, or in sending investigators to a remote section of the country, exercised proper discretion.

We all know how committees proceed. I myself was once investigated by investigators of a committee duly author-

ized by the Senate. I did not have any opportunity to cross-examine the investigators. They were sent into my State, and they made ex parte statements. I did not complain about these ex parte statements, because I have learned to take my share of it "on the chin" like everybody else.

It seems to me that we ought to try to find out the truth, whether it is for or against the Senator from North Dakota, and ought not to waste too much time in quibbling over whether the committee, in the performance of its duties, may in some particular instance have gone beyond what a court of law or a court of equity would have done in trying to find out the facts pertaining to any circumstance which goes to make up the chain of circumstances relied on by the committee in the report which it has made to the Senate.

I think the committee is entitled to such a statement as I have made. For 4 days we have sat and listened to sincere, earnest, and patient arguments on the part of the Senator from Illinois and other Senators. We ought to try to arrive at the facts, and arrive at a just conclusion based upon all the facts which may be adduced through any procedure which may be regarded as fair and just to all parties concerned. I cannot help but express my regret that in these discussions the committee itself, which is an agency of the Senate, created by the Senate and authorized by the Senate, has been regarded as the victim or the criminal—if there be such—in this case. What we are trying to find out is whether, from all the facts, the Senator from North Dakota is entitled to his seat.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think that I should make a brief statement in this connection.

In my judgment, there was nothing unfair about the method pursued by the committee in this case. It was entirely fair, and the procedure was conducted in a spirit of complete fairness. It is true that investigators were appointed to go to North Dakota and make a field investigation. As I recall, the first report received, during the chairmanship of the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], was submitted to the committee, and criticism was made of the report. I think I myself criticized it. The investigators seemed somewhat inclined to state their conclusions rather than the facts.

Thereafter the investigation went on during the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas, and that of his successor, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. The investigation proceeded in the way I have described; and, in my opinion, it was entirely fair. I am not sure that the procedure would not have been admissible even in a court of law. The evidence certainly would have been considered competent and, in the absence of some timely objection, the procedure would have been considered entirely regular.

The report of the investigators was brought to the committee. It is not necessary to say that the committee made an investigation of the report itself, to be sure what should be done, and to ascertain whether the charges were sufficient

to justify consideration by the full committee.

The report which came to the committee was the basis on which the whole inquiry was conducted.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] had full opportunity to examine the report, and he did examine it. He probably examined every line of it. He certainly had the right to do so. Counsel for the Senator from North Dakota had the right to examine every line of it. It was the basis of the examination of the witnesses who were subsequently called in person. Counsel for those who were protesting the seating of Senator LANGER and counsel for Senator LANGER had the report before them. In large part they based their questions to each witness who appeared upon the stand upon the report.

Moreover, the Senator from North Dakota had the right to have subpoenaed any witness whom he wished to have heard. If there was a single line in the report that he wished to controvert he could have called witnesses. Witnesses were called by both sides, of course; and the report constantly remained the basis of the proceeding before the committee.

The Senator from North Dakota was given full opportunity to make such statements as he wished to make. He did not confine himself to the oral testimony alone, but responded to and answered the statements made in the report and in the affidavits which were gathered by the investigators. He had full opportunity to respond to anything in the report. He was unrestricted, and there were no interruptions so long as he wished to respond to anything in the report.

I can see nothing wrong with the procedure. If the same thing had occurred in a court of law, in the absence of timely objection a record would have been made up in the court on which the issue could have gone to judicial determination. So it seems to me that there is nothing wrong with the method pursued by the committee. It was the only practical way of getting at the matter. The committee thought, rightly or wrongly, that when the report was brought in the opportunity should be given to any witness to controvert any statement made in the report. Opportunity was given to the parties in interest to examine the report and use it as a basis for questioning witnesses.

Finally, when the report was subjected to the fullest, freest inspection by the Senator from North Dakota and his counsel, and was used throughout as the basis of the trial of the issue, it seems to me that nobody can complain that the question has not been fairly considered. I was not able to attend many of the sessions of the committee; but if any complaint had even been made in my hearing that any witness was desired, or that the fullest and freest opportunity had not been given to controvert any statement in the report, if I had considered the statement to be relevant and to have any bearing whatever on the merits of the question, I would certainly have voted to make it possible to bring the witness before the committee, where he might be confronted by the Senator from North Dakota himself.

Mr. President, I felt that I should make this statement, because I certainly cannot see that there was any irregularity or any element of unfairness in the manner in which the investigation was conducted.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the purpose in sending out investigators was not to have an *ex parte* proceeding, in the ordinary sense. As I understand the term "*ex parte*," it means one-sided. The report of the investigators was the result of an investigation. I think that some of the statements in the report are favorable to Mr. LANGER. Certainly the investigators were not sent out with instructions that they should obtain only testimony against Senator LANGER; at least, I did not understand such to be their instructions. In that sense I do not think the testimony is *ex parte*; and in that sense I think that what the Senator from Georgia has just said is true. The testimony would be admissible in a court of law. It was obtained as the result of an examination made by investigators sent out as such, and not as the result of an attempt to prosecute.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in a moment. I merely wish to say a word with respect to what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] has said in regard to the investigators who went out at the beginning of the investigation. The members of the subcommittee and the investigators themselves will bear out the statement that before the investigators went to the State of North Dakota the Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the subcommittee, specifically and in unmistakable terms advised them that under no circumstances were they to go there on the theory that they were to "get" anyone in connection with this case.

That all the Senator from Illinois and the Committee on Privileges and Elections wanted to know was the truth in regard to the serious charges which had been filed here on the opening day of the session of Congress on January 3, 1941. I made that so plain that the investigators, perhaps, thought that I, myself, was some sort of a small dictator. I did so because in the past I have had some experience with investigators; and if there was anything I did not want done, it was to have an unfair and partial investigator go into the State of North Dakota. We told the petitioners, as well as Senator LANGER, that every witness whose name was given to the investigators would be interrogated while the investigators were in North Dakota. That procedure was followed. I think the names of some 20 witnesses were given on the part of Senator LANGER to the investigators, and I think some 16 of those witnesses were interrogated. Their statements were taken and are now a part of the record. I think some 3 or 4 witnesses were outside the State, or, for some reason or other, their testimony could not be taken.

In no instance did the investigators refuse to comply with the petitioners' request. While the investigators were in North Dakota they went to Attorney Murphy, who was advising the Senator

in this case. Mr. Murphy testified before our committee that the investigators came to him and asked him, as attorney for Senator LANGER, whether there were any witnesses whom he desired to have interrogated.

Mr. Murphy said, in substance, that if he knew what the witnesses on the part of the petitioners were going to testify to when they were examined by the investigators in North Dakota he would be in a much better position to inform the investigators, and that he would wait and see.

The time came, Mr. President, when all the evidence was in. The time came when Senator LANGER and his counsel had an opportunity—and plenty of time was given them—to make a thorough and fair examination of all the testimony. If they had wanted to bring to Washington, D. C., every witness whom the investigators had interrogated on the plains of North Dakota, I assure the Senate that the committee would have unanimously said, "Bring them in." Of course, we said, "Gentlemen, please keep down the expense as much as you possibly can." However, no member of the committee wanted to hamper the petitioners or the respondent by hesitating to spend any money that might be necessary to be spent in order to bring in any material witness. If they had wanted to do so, they could have brought here the gentlemen from whose testimony I have just been reading, and could have cross-examined him as long as they wanted to do so. The bars were down; there were no rigid rules of evidence; there was liberality as to all types and kinds of evidence insofar as every witness was concerned. If ever there was an investigation which was conducted thoroughly on the part of a committee, I think it is the one before us. I appreciate what the Senator from Georgia and the distinguished majority leader have said.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, although I do not know what course was pursued afterward, in fairness to the Senator from North Dakota I think I should say that while the Senator from Texas was acting as chairman of the committee he conferred with Senator LANGER and advised him that he could have witnesses appear before the investigators. Senator LANGER expressed a disinclination to do so until the report of the investigators should be filed and he should be advised and informed what the affidavits contained and what the result of the investigation was. He took the position that he could not meet the charges until he knew what the evidence of those adverse to him was.

I think it should also be said, in fairness to the Senator from North Dakota, that the report of the investigators, as well probably as the subcommittee report, was given wide publicity before the Senator from North Dakota had presented his oral evidence at the committee hearing. That report went out over the country and probably created an impression in many minds. I am not saying this for the purpose of undertaking to criticize the Senator from Illinois or to take issue with him, but I think it is fair to say



that the Senator from North Dakota expressed the view that he did not care to have witnesses summoned before the investigators until he knew what the witnesses who were adverse to him had said.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Texas says is correct. In connection with the question of dissemination of information after the committee print based on the long hearings was submitted, I should like to read the original suggestion which was made by the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question while he is locating the material which he desires to read?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. During the course of the debate there has been some criticism to the effect that the committee went far afield and gathered up too many things. I should like to have the Senator state what his impression was regarding one of the earlier meetings of the committee. My own impression is that some of us wanted to have a bill of particulars filed. We were anxious not to have a "shotgun" process. We were anxious to take dead-level aim at the specific charges. My own impression is that it was largely upon the insistence or advice of the then chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that it was decided to go into the whole matter and more or less spread it out; and I think perhaps that was the instruction which was given to the committee investigators.

If the recollection of the Senator from Illinois coincides with my recollection of the matter, I wish he would say so.

Mr. LUCAS. The junior Senator from Kentucky is absolutely correct in his statement regarding what occurred in the early days of the committee meetings. I repeat what I said once before on the floor of the Senate—that in the early part of the proceedings, with all we had before us, the Senator from Illinois was among those who repeatedly demanded more specific charges, and even a bill of particulars. The record will show that I specifically stated that I was not in favor of sending a fishing expedition into the State of North Dakota. That is the truth of the matter; and the Senator from Kentucky was one of those who agreed with me on that point. But what I suggested was not done.

Mr. CHANDLER. It should be said that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I believe, entertained the view that we should have specific charges.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and other Senators took the position that, inasmuch as we had received petitions, letters, and evidence, and the people of North Dakota had made a complaint, and those matters were before us, we had to make the investigation; there was nothing else we could do; we had to investigate.

I now desire to say something with respect to what the Senator from Texas said a while ago with respect to the dissemination of the confidential print, which was in the nature of a report and memorandum of information. It was

submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections after the subcommittee had sat for days going through the testimony with the investigators. We finally submitted the first print, hoping that it would give the committee some information.

The minority report says that we drew conclusions and made recommendations. That is not the fact. We drew no conclusions; we made no recommendations; but we did make observations and suggestions, and one of the observations made to the full committee was:

#### OBSERVATIONS

(1) That the names of all witnesses heretofore submitted by the petitioners to be examined by said investigators have been interviewed and their testimony taken, except in such cases where said witnesses were unavailable or could not be reached without incurring what appeared to the investigators as being excessive expenses or loss of time, or where the witnesses' testimony appeared to have little or no evidentiary value

(2) That the names of all witnesses heretofore submitted by the respondent to be examined by said investigators have been interviewed and their testimony taken, with the exception of four character witnesses who were outside of the State or away from their usual abode and who consequently could not be reached by said investigators.

#### SUGGESTIONS

(1) That copies of this confidential print be delivered to the respondent, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, and his attorneys, as well as the attorneys for petitioners, with all convenient speed.

That is the point I wanted to make. In other words, just the moment we agreed upon this report, it was in the hands of the respondent; it was in the hands of the attorneys for the respondent. The chances are, if any Senator wanted to get a copy of this printed at that time, he could have had it; perhaps copies were distributed; I do not know; I was not chairman of the committee, and I do not know what was done about that; but every Senator was entitled to a copy of this and could have had a copy of it at that time. Because of the length of these proceedings, because of the tremendous amount of work involved, it was my opinion that the Senate ought to be enlightened gradually upon this matter. This was one of the ways, perhaps, we could do it, by giving this print out at that particular time, but there were no conclusions, there were no recommendations made. There were observations and suggestions; and when the committee met they followed the suggestions and the observations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The report itself ends up with conclusions, and, while I want to assure the Senator from Illinois that I have absolutely no criticism of his presentation of this matter on the floor, and certainly I have no criticism of him or anyone else on the committee, nevertheless, when there are what are referred to as conclusions, I do not think that the minority report—

Mr. LUCAS. "Conclusion" is the headline, and under it are the words;

In conclusion, your subcommittee respectfully makes the following observations and suggestions.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think the Senator should be too critical of the minority report in referring to conclusions, for I am not critical of him in any way. I think he has done a good job on the floor presenting the case.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I am sure he and I are going to get along all right.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I sincerely hope that we can get along with the trial of this matter. We have spent 2 hours talking about a totally inconsequential point. No one here is trying to throw any of the members of the committee out of the Senate; they are all going to be here regardless of the outcome of this particular controversy. I am deeply interested in charge No. 11. The Senator from Illinois was making a fine statement along the line of that charge. I want to know what the facts are, and what the truth is concerning that matter, and I hope, from now on, we can go ahead with the trial of the case and stop trying the committee. I myself may have been somewhat guilty along that line, but the Senator from Illinois goaded me a little bit the other day, and I regret very much the remark I then made. I think now, however, we ought to start trying the Langer case and not the Lucas case or any other case.

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Michigan, and I have been trying to do that for 4 days.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I agree that my friend from Michigan is largely responsible for all this, and I regret what he said the other day, because I feel like the committee, in a way, is being charged with not proceeding properly. I do not think the committee can be subjected to such a charge; and I really want to compliment the Senator from Illinois on the hard work he and the subcommittee have done. They have diligently and patiently performed their duties, and have no desire that the result be one way or the other. I thought, from some things that have been said, that, perhaps, the committee was on trial, and some of us thought we ought to answer, at least, before sentence was pronounced. That is the reason some of us agreed to answer for the committee. If the Senate will let the Senator from Illinois proceed for a while, we can get back to the trial of the case.

Mr. LUCAS. I have absolutely no animosity toward the Senator from Michigan as the result of what he said the other day. It is one of those unfortunate things that happen, and perhaps I was partially responsible. I repeat what I have already said when I state that when the Senator asked me the question, I turned to the investigator to ascertain what the facts were, and it looked as if I was not paying any attention to the Senator; he had just returned from a long trip and was tired, and I was tired; but now everything is

all right between the two of us, I will say to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. Before I was diverted from the line of my argument about an hour ago—

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, may I ask a question by way of information I desire?

Mr. LUCAS. I should be glad to answer, if I can.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the committee sent investigators out, how many did it send?

Mr. LUCAS. Two.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What were the instructions given them?

Mr. LUCAS. I was not chairman of the committee, but at that time I had something to do with the employment of one of the investigators.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Who was he?

Mr. LUCAS. Sam Hood, of Texas. I can tell the Senator how I got him, if he would like to know. I never saw the man before in my life until he came here and was employed. Mr. Smith, the other investigator, was with the Gillette investigating committee last year and that is how he happened to be here. To these gentlemen were presented the charges; that is, the petition and the answer which had been filed, along with the letters and affidavits, and all the different exhibits which were in the hands of the majority leader of the Senate on January 3, 1941, and which were all sent to the committee. I will say to the Senator, from an examination of the precedents, I found that in the past in the important cases of this kind pending before the Senate, usually a resolution was adopted authorizing and directing the committee to do certain things. That was not done in this case. There was, apparently, no particular interest in the beginning on the part of any Senator; but there were received a number of letters and affidavits, as I recall, and perhaps a petition filed by a man named Verry and others against the right of Senator LANGER to a seat in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What were the investigators to do?

Mr. LUCAS. They were to investigate the charges contained in the petition. First, we caused the lawyers to file an amended petition, and they did file an amended petition. Edward R. Burke, former Senator, was the counsel for the petitioners.

An amended petition and an answer were filed, upon which the issue was joined, and upon that petition and answer the investigators went to North Dakota to make the investigation.

They had the power, under Senate Resolution 118, to investigate anything and anybody who knew anything about any of the transactions involved in the petition. For instance, take the charge in the petition that Senator LANGER was guilty of moral turpitude over a period of 20 years. That was a broad charge. The Senator knows that, unless, as in a court of law, the petitioners were compelled to file a bill of particulars specifying what the charges were, the gate was left wide open, and that all such charges could be investigated.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Were the investigators to investigate under that sort of a charge?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did any members of the committee go with the investigators?

Mr. LUCAS. No; not to North Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then, the two investigators went out with carte blanche to investigate Senator LANGER and all the charges that have been made against him?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, sir; and the Senator from California voted for the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Suppose I did?

Mr. LUCAS. Then, the Senator is just as much responsible as I am in this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, no.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the Senator voted for Senate Resolution 118, which I read into the record more than once, giving the investigators the power to do the very things they did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, not in this case, because the first day I withdrew from it.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that, but I am talking about the resolution. I will say to my good friend, the Senator from California, that there came from the Committee on Privileges and Elections to the Senate, Senate Resolution 118, and the Senate acted on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is all right, but I simply want to get to the facts. I do not know that there is any desire to exclude any of the facts; I think that my questions have been pertinent, and have been plain, and I think they ought to require a plain and pertinent answer.

Mr. LUCAS. I have tried to do the best I could, but I will answer the Senator further if he desires.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will try again for a moment. I shall not detain the Senator long, because I realize that he is tired and weary; he has stood on the floor for an ungodly length of time, and taxed his physical endurance to the utmost.

However, these two men went out there to make the investigation themselves, with nobody over them, nobody directing them. That is correct, as I understand?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have to disagree with the Senator from Georgia who, I am sorry, is not present. I do not think that sort of thing would be tolerated in a court for 15 seconds.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia made the specific statement that it would be tolerated unless objection was made in due time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, well, unless objection was made.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Georgia took the legal position that objections coming in the course of the argument in a court of law would be of no avail. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It has been my fate to try a great many cases, and to be interested in a great many kinds of cases, but I have never known

of testimony being admitted in any court in this land when such procedure was followed. It is simply a question of fact, as between my recollection and that of the Senator from Georgia, perhaps, but I have stated my recollection. To send out a couple of investigators, with a great record as to this case, and have them determine what was relevant and what was not, have them determine which testimony should be admitted and which should not be admitted, and have them determine the fact—

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator contend that any rule of relevancy is followed in presenting testimony in the Senate, or in any committee thereof?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly there should be relevancy.

Mr. LUCAS. I have never found it to be so.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We should be more careful of the relevancy of testimony when we are trying one of our own Members.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps that is true, but there is no rule of relevancy observed in the United States Senate; there is no rule of germaneness. If some one desires to present a resolution along that line, I shall support it, although I know there has never been any rule of germaneness in the Senate in its whole history. The House of Representatives did have one.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There has been such a rule observed in trials in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate may have followed such practice in a case of impeachment, but not in a matter of this kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have observed it in trials repeatedly and continuously.

Mr. LUCAS. The rules of relevancy?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly we have followed it.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean here on the Senate floor? I should like to have him read the report of the Reed committee, which made the investigation into the case of Frank Smith, of Illinois, if the Senator thinks there was any relevancy rule followed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senate halted him at the door.

Mr. LUCAS. They halted him at the door, and they indicted the people of Illinois at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Perhaps they did.

Mr. LUCAS. I mean so far as the fact is concerned, and one of the things contended here is that the matters have been passed on by the people of North Dakota, and that therefore we have no right to go into them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator is getting away from the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not getting away from the question; I am talking about the question of relevancy and materiality.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well, we will omit that temporarily. Of course, the rule as to relevancy and materiality is observed in the United States Senate in a trial that is being conducted by the United States Senate.



Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry that someone did not lay down the rules for the committee before we went into this investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am sorry, too.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois has been here only 3 years, and I may not be familiar with all the rules, but I was doing the best I could, and I have merely followed the policy I thought the Senate had been pursuing for 150 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no disposition on my part to criticize the Senator. He must not take what I have said as criticism. There is no desire on my part to criticize.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no desire to do or say aught against the Senate committee. That is not my purpose at all. My purpose is to show, by the Senator's admissions now, that the investigators went forth and performed a function in relation to this case which was the function of the United States Senate and of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that that is exactly what they did.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. And I wish to repeat, for about the seventh time, and I want to make it emphatic, in the hope I shall not have to repeat it again, that the Committee on Privileges and Elections brought in a resolution, Senate Resolution 118, which was presented to the United States Senate, and read by the clerk of the Senate, and under the power and authority vested in the committee by that resolution, the investigators had the right to do exactly what they did in connection with the investigation they made. Not a single objection was made by any Senator when the resolution came up for consideration. So it is no fault of mine.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am not claiming it is any fault of the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that; but Senators keep reiterating that the investigators have gone into North Dakota, and have done this and have done that, apparently without any right or authority. Whatever they did, whatever these men are guilty of, the United States Senate is equally guilty of, because they derived their power and authority solely from a resolution which was unanimously passed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It would not be the first time the United States Senate had been guilty of some sort of wrong. The wrong has been perpetrated, and the wrong occurs in the presentation of the sort of evidence now submitted.

Mr. LUCAS. It is perfectly all right if the Senator from California desires to lay the blame on the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have not any hesitancy in doing so if it deserves it.

Mr. LUCAS. If there is any wrong—and I do not say that there is—the blame belongs on the United States Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I do not think it can be assumed that any

Member of the Senate is more interested in Senator LANGER's case than were Senator LANGER and his attorneys; they were informed and knew of every step that was taken. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that if they had made timely objection, which they did not make, to any step of the procedure, and if the testimony had been taken in spite of the objection, there would have been grievous error. But they made no objection. No objection was made either by Senator LANGER or by his employed attorneys, and the committee proceeded to do exactly what, under the circumstances, they were instructed to do.

I do not believe the committee is subject to censure, or that the Senate is, because we had to proceed, and we proceeded according to directions, with the respondent looking out for his own interests, and with employed attorneys. We brought the case to the Senate, and it is here. No one has intended to work a hardship on anyone, or to avoid in any instance giving everyone everything to which he is entitled, or anything he asks for.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is looking directly at me.

Mr. CHANDLER. I like to look at the Senator; it does not mean I am complaining about him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no complaint of the committee; there is no complaint of the subcommittee; there is a complaint as to the procedure which has been pursued.

Mr. CHANDLER. Senator LANGER did not complain.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. CHANDLER. His lawyers did not complain.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether they did or not.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is generally assumed that when one employs lawyers, if there is anything which justifies complaint, they make it. If I were in Senator LANGER's situation, I should complain if I did not agree with what was being done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Some lawyers would and some lawyers would not.

Mr. CHANDLER. There was no complaint in this case, so the Senator from Illinois proceeded according to his direction and according to the understanding that he should ascertain everything that was existent. Some of us wanted a bill of particulars; we wanted specific charges; charges which we thought were serious charges, not just all sorts of charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. So you brought in a general charge of moral turpitude.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Texas instructed, and the Senator from Illinois so understood, that that was the business of the committee. They disregarded the expressed wish of some of us. As I recall, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and I thought there should be specific charges, and that we should investigate them to see if there was enough to warrant an investigation. The Senator from

Illinois said he did not want to go on a fishing expedition. Some of us might have liked to go to North Dakota again, but we decided to save the people's money and not send an expedition to North Dakota to try to find the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a most exemplary habit, to save the people's money.

Mr. CHANDLER. Some of us do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is a splendid habit, and those guided by that consideration are to be highly commended. But that is neither here nor there. Our difference is merely over a question of fact. The Senator construes it one way and I construe it another. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that some timely objection should have been made. The objection was not made; and, not having been made when it was in order to have made it, it seems to me it should not be made now; that it is too late to make it now.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a pretty important case I am reading, and it might have some connection with the objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this is a demurrer against the jurisdiction or the conduct of the committee, I wish the court would pass on the demurrer so that we can get down to the merits of the case.

Mr. LUCAS. I think some general demurrers have been filed, but no special demurrer has been filed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Senator from Illinois, because I know he is tired after 4 days of conducting this matter—

Mr. LUCAS. I am just getting my second wind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A little while ago the Senator stated that he had been derailed from the line of his argument about an hour before, and the senior Senator from Kentucky and I perhaps facetiously spoke of this whole matter as a demurrer. Since I was the one who very innocently asked the Senator what I considered a very pertinent question as to the merits of the evidence he was offering, in order that I might attach whatever weight to it I might desire, sitting here as a judge, I should like to call attention to what happened.

My question did not last over a minute or two, but at that point the senior Senator from Kentucky rose to his feet and delivered a lengthy lecture, admonishing the Senate as to what its conduct should be, and what the attitude of individual Senators should be in attaching weight to the evidence presented. The Senator from Illinois responded in suitable terms.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], a member of the committee, then entered upon a lengthy defense of the committee, complimenting the committee in terms of suitable laudation, which were appropriately acknowledged by the Senator from Illinois. The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] then entered upon a defense of the committee, which was also suitably acknowledged by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]

then rose and demanded that the matter proceed, and took up some time apologizing for something he said a day or two ago, which apology was accepted by the Senator from Illinois. So that if the Senator was derailed from the line of his thought, I merely wish to say that I had nothing to do with it further than to ask a simple question as to the nature of the document from which he was reading, in order that I might attach to the document whatever weight I thought proper.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] along with other Senators who have been so complimentary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri simply put the Senator from Illinois on the side-track. The Senator was not derailed. The Senator from Missouri put him on the side-track.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not yield further. I wish to proceed now with the testimony of Walter Burk, and place that in the record before we close the session today. The testimony is not very lengthy.

Before I was derailed by the Senator from Missouri about an hour or two ago. [Laughter.] I was reading from the records made by the investigators involving the testimony of the State's attorney, Walter Burk, in connection with the bond proceedings in Williams County. I continue to read:

Answer. Before the date of the hearing an amended complaint was served on me which contained the allegations as to the bond issue, and also that I had commenced a certain garnishment action on behalf of the Williston Rural Credit Co. as plaintiff, and L. B. Dochtorman, and in which Williams County was named as garnisher.

The complaint also charged that I, as State's attorney, had failed to do my duty in failing to punish the proprietor of a certain roadhouse located within Williams County.

And this, Mr. President, was the complaint that was filed by certain citizens of that county and referred to the Governor of the State, who under the law had the right to pass upon a proposition of this kind, and either suspend or dismiss him.

I continue to read from Mr. Burk's testimony.

Question. At whose instance was this complaint brought, if you know?

Answer. I am informed, and I am positive, that the Governor of North Dakota, William Langer, Frank Vogel, manager of the Bank of North Dakota, and Oscar E. Erickson, commissioner of insurance of North Dakota, were the ones who advised and secured the complaint of removal.

Question. Do you know where the complaint was drawn?

Answer. I was advised by one of the assistant attorneys general of North Dakota that the complaint was drawn in the office of the attorney general.

Question. Was that Mr. Thompson?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you know his initials?

Answer. T. A.

Question. T. A. Thompson?

Answer. Yes. Both the original and the copy of the complaint having been printed

on the—strike that—the complaint—both the original and the copy of the complaint were prepared on the legal stationery of the attorney general.

Question. Now, did some of the local people here sign the complaint originally?

Mr. President, the important thing about the matter, and I want the Senate to understand it, is to show the connection of this person who got out this complaint against the commissioners and the State's attorney.

Answer. The complaint was signed by local employees of the State highway department—just a minute, let me see (refers to papers)—the complaint was signed by George McChesney, whom I had prosecuted and convicted on a criminal charge; Eugene Byrns; L. W. Johnson, a local employee of the State highway department; Oscar Moberaten, an employee of the State highway department; and Frank Byrnes.

Question. What was his position?

Answer. My recollection is that he is related to L. W. Johnson, an employee of the State highway department.

Question. Now, then, do you know who secured those signatures on the complaint?

Answer. Roy W. Frazier.

Question. What was his position at that time?

Answer. He was a traveling inspector for the State highway department.

Question. Was Mr. Frazier a strong political ally of Mr. Langer?

Answer. I know that of my own personal knowledge that he was.

Question. As a matter of fact, had he, in 1936, or during the campaign of that year, been the campaign manager?

Answer. I don't believe he was State campaign manager, but at one time he was on the State central committee—strike that State central committee out—he was on the State committee of the Non-Partisan League, which had the management of the Langer campaign.

Senators, listen to this:

Question. Did you check the expense voucher of Mr. Frazier relative to the trip that he made out here to get the signatures on the complaint; and if so, what did you find?

Answer. I personally, at Bismarck, checked the original voucher bearing Frazier's original signature, and found that all of the trips which he had made to Williams County in connection with my removal proceedings, including the date that he secured the signatures upon the removal proceedings, were charged to the State highway department and paid out of the highway fund.

Question. Now, then, when he got this complaint signed by the various complainants, was a copy served on you at that time?

Answer. The—according to the information which I have, which I am certain is accurate—the complaint was taken back to Bismarck, the Governor signed it; then, later, Frazier returned to Williston with the complaint, delivered it to the sheriff's office, and it was served on me by J. D. Jeffrey, deputy sheriff.

Mr. President, the point I am making in connection with this complaint is that here we have a case of at least three out of the five persons being on the State pay roll, the fourth one being a relative of one of those on the pay roll, and Senator LANGER was then Governor of North Dakota. The individual who obtained the signatures was also on the State highway department pay roll. He went out there and obtained the signatures on this petition to oust these commissioners, and to oust the State's at-

torney, in connection with this bond issue, and he charged the expenses of his trip to the taxpayers of North Dakota.

I continue to read:

Question. Then, subsequent to the hearing. I mean subsequent to the service of the complaint and prior to the hearing, were there some changes made in the complaint as served on them?

Answer. I was informed by a resident of Williston that the complaint had been changed after it had been signed by the petitioners.

Question. Did some of the petitioners admit that on examination?

Answer. The petitioners admitted that the complaint had been signed on two different times.

All of the testimony relative to the alteration of the complaint is included in the transcript of the testimony. The first page of the transcript has been torn off, but the first page contained none of the testimony [indicating].

Question. This is the transcript, these yellow sheets here?

Mr. President, the point I want to make, without reading all this testimony into the Record, is that the State's attorney was suspended, and he had to carry his case to the courts, he had to take an appeal on the matter, which he had a right to do. He was suspended by the then Governor of North Dakota in connection with this bond issue, and he had to take an appeal to the court, and upon that appeal the judge ordered him to be reinstated. Nothing ever came of the suspension of the commissioners. They were suspended. Governor LANGER went out of office. The commissioners were later reelected.

Mr. President, I read from a certified copy of the order, being exhibit 2 of the records:

The above-entitled matter having come on for hearing before me at court chambers in the courthouse in the city of Minot, Ward County, N. Dak., on the 23d day of June 1939 pursuant to the stipulation of J. A. Coffey, special prosecutor, and Walter O. Burk, the above-named defendant; J. A. Coffey appearing for the prosecution and the defendant appearing in person as his own attorney and the court having heard the arguments and having examined the records and files in said action, including the transcript of the testimony and having duly considered the matter: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Ordered, That the order of WILLIAM LANGER, as Governor of the State of North Dakota, dated December 31, 1938, removing the defendant, Walter O. Burk, from the office of State's attorney of Williams County, N. Dak., be, and same is hereby, in all things vacated, reversed, annulled, and set aside; and it is further

Ordered, That any and all orders made by WILLIAM LANGER, as Governor of the State of North Dakota, suspending the defendant, Walter O. Burk, from the office of State's attorney of Williams County, N. Dak., be, and the same are hereby, in all things annulled, vacated, and set aside; and it is further

Ordered, That the defendant, Walter O. Burk, be, and is hereby, reinstated to the office of State's attorney of Williams County, N. Dak., with all the rights, privileges, and emoluments, including the right to the salary of the office, with interest thereto pertaining as of the 29th day of March 1938, the date of the suspension of the defendant, Walter O. Burk, from the office of State's attorney of Williams County, N. Dak., as fully as if said order of removal and order of suspension had never been made; and it is further



*Ordered*, That judgment be entered by the clerk of the district court of Logan County, N. Dak., in accordance with this order.

While this gentleman was under suspension he was a candidate for reelection, but was defeated at the polls by 129 votes, and nothing ever happened, insofar as the suspension of the commissioners was concerned, other than to remove them for the time being until they could be reelected.

Mr. President, the very witnesses whose names were signed to the petition involved in this bond deal in North Dakota are significant to me, if this witness tells the truth—and he is under oath. While the affidavit is an *ex parte* affidavit—and Senators can take it for whatever it is worth—Senator Langer had the right, through his attorney, to bring this gentleman in and cross-examine him if he wanted to do so before the full committee.

This is the situation. Simply because this fellow Mueller, who bought these bonds at three-quarters of 1 percent profit, was not in with Brunk and Brewer, they were going to show that he could not operate in North Dakota, and if Senators examine the records from that time on they will find that any bond issues that Mr. Mueller sold in North Dakota went through Brunk and Brewer after this procedure in Williams County. To me that is a significant fact.

Senators may think whatever they want to about it. They may draw whatever conclusions they desire about this situation. Senators cannot tell me that the Governor of North Dakota did not know something about this \$140,000 bond transaction made in that county, with Brunk and Brewer holding a complete monopoly upon the bond business there, especially in view of what the Governor did in suspending the State's attorney because he gave wrong legal advice in connection with this bond issue.

Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to discuss just one more point, and then I am going to ask the majority leader to suspend, if I may.

Something has been said in connection with this case about various bond salesmen buying bonds in North Dakota through 1937 and 1938 from these different counties, and I turn to page 93 of the committee print. On that page will be found a report by Clyde Duffey, special counsel for Governor Moses, made in connection with the attempt to ferret out this thing. On page 94 will be found a reference to Grant County.

Grant County: Grant County issued \$161,000 of 4-percent bonds, dated May 1, 1937. The records of the county auditor show that these bonds were sold to Allison-Williams Co. at a discount of \$10,159. On June 12, 1937, O. E. Erickson was authorized by the industrial commission to purchase \$126,000 of these bonds from V. W. Brewer Co. at par, plus accrued interest, and this purchase was completed on June 21 through the Bank of North Dakota acting as collecting agent for V. W. Brewer Co. The bank purchased the other \$35,000 of bonds from V. W. Brewer Co. at par and accrued interest on June 18, 1937. The bank had held \$155,000 of certificates of indebtedness of this county which were paid through refinancing process.

Allison-Williams Co. purchased \$161,000 worth of bonds, but Erickson purchased \$126,000 of them from Brewer. In other words, there was not a single bond issue in this whole transaction in which Brewer and Brunk were not interested somewhere. I do not care in whose names the bonds were purchased in the beginning; Brewer and Brunk will be found making final disposition of the bonds.

Reading further from the memorandum:

Adams County: Adams County issued \$66,000 of 4½-percent bonds, dated August 15, 1937. These were sold to H. E. Mueller at par. On September 4, 1937, the Bank of North Dakota purchased these bonds from H. E. Mueller at 103½. Before making the sale to Mueller the county applied to the State land department and the Bank of North Dakota, but the application was rejected by both.

This was an issue of bonds with respect to which application was made to the State Bank of North Dakota to buy the bonds. The bank had the power to do so. The proceeding in Williams County was instituted by the petitioners, and the Governor of the State suspended certain persons because they did not ask the State bank to purchase the bonds in the beginning, or give the State bank the opportunity to purchase them. In this instance, when the State bank was given the opportunity to buy the bonds, it said, "We do not want the bonds." Mueller bought them, and in turn sold them to the State National Bank, as did Brewer and Brunk on many occasions.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator recall what Mr. Stangler, the manager of the bank, said with reference to turning down those issues?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I recall what Mr. Stangler said in that connection. I shall be satisfied if every Member of the Senate will read Stangler's entire testimony in connection with all these transactions. The important fact is that when Senator Langer became Governor in 1937 Stangler was demoted as the head of the State institution, after having been with the institution for 6 or 7 years. Senator Langer's friend Vogel was placed at the head of that institution. Regardless of what Stangler may have testified to, the individual who is at the head of the institution has the responsibility for all these matters.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If Mr. Vogel was the man who was responsible, then does not the Senator think that in order to get the true story the Committee on Privileges and Elections should have called Mr. Vogel to testify?

Mr. LUCAS. That was one of the things that the Senator could have done. It was within his power to do it.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Was not Vogel present at the hearing?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know; but if the Senator will allow me to take the time, I will say that in substance Mr. Stangler testified that the bank did not want any complete issue of bonds but wanted to purchase early maturities. He also said that the bank was loaded up with certificates of indebtedness, warrants, and so forth, and that it exchanged those evidences of indebtedness for short-term maturities, but that it could not load itself up with bonds running over a long period of time.

Mr. LUCAS. Not unless Brewer and Brunk sold them. If Brewer and Brunk came in with an issue, whether they were short-term or long-term bonds, they sold them.

Mr. MURDOCK. To the Bank of North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to have the Senator point out to me one scintilla of evidence offered by Mr. Stangler showing that that occurred.

Mr. LUCAS. What is this all about? They made \$300,000 in profits on bonds which they sold in North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no question about that; but the question in my mind—and I think it is a fair question—is, What is the evidence on the part of the man from the Bank of North Dakota who handled the bonds? What does he say about it? If the Senator will read Stangler's testimony again he will find that he said that the bank was not interested in any complete issue, but was interested in the shorter maturities. I think it is only fair to go to the record made by Mr. Stangler on that particular question.

Mr. LUCAS. It is perfectly all right with me. The Senator can read Stangler's entire testimony into the Record when he gets to it. I shall not do so; but I am perfectly satisfied with Stangler's testimony. I hope every member of the Senate will read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Have I not quoted it with substantial accuracy?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether the Senator has or not.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is certainly familiar with Stangler's testimony.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask the Senator whether or not I have quoted it substantially correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot tell whether the Senator has or not. When the time comes I want the Senator to read his entire testimony.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have been speaking in plain English.

Mr. LUCAS. We gave Stangler an absolutely clean bill of health. He was an excellent witness. His deportment was fine. He was the type of man whom I should like to have running such an institution for me if I had one. But when Senator Langer became Governor, Stangler was demoted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator know how Stangler first got into the

bank? Who brought him there in the first place? It was Governor LANGER.

Mr. LUCAS. And Governor LANGER demoted him.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. When Governor LANGER became Governor in 1937 he demoted Stangler.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And put in his place Mr. Vogel, who had been a small-town banker in Cold Harbor, N. Dak. The little bank with which he had been connected failed in the crash. Then he was brought in to run one of the greatest institutions in the Northwest, the State Bank of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the law every cent of money that comes from counties and municipalities must go through the cage of that particular bank. It has charge of practically everything. Stangler was the man who saved the bank, as his testimony shows.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. It was Stangler who came to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as his testimony shows, and obtained the money which saved the Bank of North Dakota from a crash. He was rewarded by being demoted; and a small-town banker, with very little banking experience, was put in his place. Whatever Mr. Vogel's banking experience had been, his bank fell by the wayside in the crash. However, for a number of years he had been the bosom political, financial, and social ally of the Governor of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If Senator LANGER, while Governor, mistreated Mr. Stangler, would it not have been natural for Mr. Stangler, if there had been anything bad about Governor LANGER's connection with the bank, to have been the first one to bring it out in his testimony? The Senator has made much of the fact that Governor LANGER demoted Stangler. If he did so unjustly, would not Stangler wish to retaliate, and would not we find the retaliation in his testimony?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can draw his own conclusion along that line. I am only presenting the facts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would not that be natural?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether it would be natural or not. I do not know what the relationship between the two men was. We can never tell about those things. We cannot speculate and conjecture as to what some man might have done under certain circumstances.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is exactly my position in this case.

Mr. LUCAS. I am only laying the cold facts before the Senate. I know that Mr. Stangler, who had been there all those years, was demoted.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Stangler did not ask to be demoted. I know that a small-town banker, whose bank had gone down in the crash, was put in Mr. Stangler's place

at the head of the State Bank of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. That fact is rather significant to me, in view of the fact that Mr. Vogel was with Mr. LANGER in the early days in 1934 and 1935, during the various trials.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question? I shall not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I shall decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to suspend at this point?

Mr. LUCAS. I wish I might.

POSTMASTER—ANNA SCHILD ELLIS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the executive calendar. That is the nomination of Anna Schild Ellis to be postmaster at Watts Bar Dam. I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the nomination be confirmed and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate resumed consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 220) declaring WILLIAM LANGER not entitled to be a United States Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to inquire as to the possibility of entering into some agreement under which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] may continue tomorrow, and the minority of the committee may proceed probably on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no information as to how much more time the Senator from Illinois wishes to occupy.

Mr. MURDOCK. He has stated to me that he will occupy all of tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois is now in the Chamber.

The Senator from Utah has made the suggestion that the Senator from Illinois wishes to occupy the time of the Senate tomorrow, and suggests that we might have an understanding that on Monday the minority may proceed. I have told the Senator from Utah that I cannot make any agreement in that connection. I do not know how much longer the Senator from Illinois may wish to proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Illinois can avoid a number of highly technical and specialized arguments regarding what the committee should or should not have done a long time ago, I think it will be possible for me to conclude tomorrow, even including a discussion of the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think we can make any iron-clad agreement regarding the matter. Of course, I think the Senator from Illinois can control the time

consumed tomorrow by refusing to yield for all sorts of things. The Senator has been very generous in that regard.

Mr. LUCAS. Tomorrow I shall try to finish my statement regarding the facts. If I may have 1 hour for discussion of the legal points on which I am prepared to speak, I can conclude by tomorrow afternoon; but if we have to go again into a long dissertation on what the committee did do or did not do, of course, we may be here for a long time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I have no control over that.

Mr. LUCAS. Nor have I.

Mr. BARKLEY. However, as I said to the Senator from Illinois, and as I tried to indicate today, I do not think the committee is required to apologize for its course in the matter. It did its duty as it saw it. I do not think the Senate regards the committee as having done otherwise; and I say to the Senator that if I were he I should not waste too much time in that connection.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that I am not at all worried about what the Senate thinks about the committee; because, as I have said many times, I want it understood that in what I have done, I have sought to do my duty under my oath.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senate appreciates that.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to be tolerant and fair with everyone, because I should not wish to do any injustice to Senator LANGER; neither do I want to do any injustice to the integrity of the United States Senate. It seems to me that a great many questions have been asked on just one theory; those who have asked the questions have forgotten, apparently, that, after all, the integrity of the Senate is involved in this case just as much as is the integrity of the respondent. However, very few arguments have been made about the integrity of the United States Senate, which has been in existence for 150 years.

If ever a time comes when the integrity of the Senate falls, if ever a time comes when the people of the United States reach the conclusion that there is no integrity remaining in the Senate, then one of the great foundation stones of government will have been removed. That is what I am interested in avoiding. I am not interested in personalities.

I have no personal feeling about the matter one way or the other. As I said in the beginning, I am interested in only that one thing: I want to see the Senate of the United States continue the same high degree of integrity and honor it has had in the past. I say with all due deference that when I read this record from beginning to end I cannot vote for Senator LANGER, because I think that with this record the integrity of the Senate will be impaired if he remained a Member. I say that coldly, bluntly, and honestly, without the slightest emotion one way or the other, without the slightest feeling toward Senator LANGER. I have had no trouble with the Senator, and will not have any, whether he retains his seat or not; but I have a duty to perform, as every other Senator has. I shall not



object to any other Senator's decision on the matter. I have not been button-holing any Senators, trying to persuade them to do what I think should be done in this case. I have not done that, and would not do it. When my task in this connection is finished I shall simply bow gracefully out of the picture. Whatever the vote may be, it will be perfectly all right with the Senator from Illinois. I have simply done a duty, and a difficult one; but the Senate may have some trouble in persuading me to serve on such a committee again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Illinois can control the length of time required in this respect, just as any other Senator can. He can control the number of times he yields to other Senators; and if he wishes to conclude his discussion of the matter tomorrow, it is within his power to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that I shall change my tactics, and shall no longer yield so liberally, because I desire to conclude my discussion of the matter, and let some other Senator resume the case where I stop. If I make a number of mistakes, that will be to the advantage of the opposition; then the opposition can obtain the floor and attack my presentation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, let me ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he intends that we shall adjourn over Saturday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to avoid a session on Saturday, and I do not think the Senate wishes to have a session on Saturday. It is not my purpose now to move for a session on Saturday.

Mr. MURDOCK. May it be understood that the Senator from Illinois will occupy all the time tomorrow? A number of other Senators have spoken to me regarding the order of procedure tomorrow, but I have not been able to tell them whether there would be time for them to speak. However, if it may be understood that the Senator from Illinois will occupy all the time available tomorrow, we can agree that there will be nothing from the other side until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suppose that the Senator from Illinois would wish to be compelled to occupy all the time tomorrow, unless he should find it necessary to do so in order to conclude his remarks. However, from what he has said, I gather that probably he will occupy most of the time tomorrow—in which event we shall go over until Monday.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 13, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of March 5), 1942:

#### POSTMASTER

Anna Schild Ellis, Watts Bar Dam, Tenn.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who spared not Thy only Son but didst deliver Him up for us all, hear our prayer. In Him we have the nobility of purpose, the power of self-denial, and the elevation of soul which are sublime proofs that He came from God, the Father. Grant that everything in our thoughts, our emotions, and in our conduct may have their inspiration in Him. His was the most saintly life, the most sublime face which ever fronted danger and death for the oppressed.

Thou who wast wounded for our transgressions and reviled not, may we learn from Thy meekness and gentleness and find peace for our souls, disturbed by avarice, pride, and passion. We pray that the spirit of the Master whose strength is for weakness, whose purity for sin, and whose goodness for need may be a voice reigning in all hearts. Oh help us to see Thy footprints and the path they trod, though steep and hard; it is Thy way, O Lord.

Have pity, Lord, on hearts that lie Wrapped in a selfish sleep, at peace That will not wake at misery's cry, That can be glad while others weep, That shut Thy holy light away And dream that their own light is day.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### ADDITIONAL ORDNANCE MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION FACILITIES

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2249) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 2249), as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000 for necessary tools, equipment, and facilities for the manufacture or production of ordnance material, munitions, and armor at either private or public plants.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose, erect or extend buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and in private establishments provide plant protection in-

stallations, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to report to Congress within 6 months from the enactment of this act a statement of all lands acquired under this section showing the acreage, location, and the price of each such acquisition.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is just an expansion of a program already started.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. This is to authorize an additional expenditure of \$100,000,000 to provide certain ordnance facilities, and I may state that the Rules Committee has already granted a rule for the consideration of this bill and filed the rule yesterday. I am hoping we may get it through by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Navy Department has endorsed the measure.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This is a Senate bill unanimously passed by the Senate and unanimously reported by the House Naval Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 447 was also laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief excerpt from a House report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BEITER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Plainfield Courier-News, containing an amazing statement about cultural agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and

to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Alaska Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by post No. 16, American Legion, of Stockton, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

[Mr. O'CONNOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the Brotherhood Week-Script No. 3. I have been informed by the Public Printer that this would exceed the amount and would cost \$105. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by me last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker last week the House concurred in an amendment to strike \$1,000,000 from the funds of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Here is one evidence of some of the work which that Bureau does. It is a book of 134 pages, printed on very fine gloss paper, and it purports to be a pictorial study of a village in New Mexico. They say that it is 1 of 6 such studies and that it will be a companion volume to certain research studies, making a total of 12. This can be purchased for 45 cents. It is a beautiful camera study of El Cerrito, N. Mex. That is part of the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business today, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### REPEAL OF PENSIONS FOR CERTAIN APPOINTIVE OFFICERS, ETC.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to H. R. 6690 which I have introduced. This bill provides for the repeal of pensions for some 250,000 appointive officers and employees of the Federal Government through the recently enacted Ramspeck Act.

Keep in mind these 250,000 persons referred to have nothing to do with Civil Service or the merit system. They are purely political appointments.

These 250,000 receive salaries up to \$10,000, possibly \$18,000, a year and the pensions provided for them run up to \$5,000 per year. The cost to the Government for these pensions is more than \$44,000,000 annually.

The mere repeal of Congressmen's pensions was not enough. This Congress will not have done its duty unless it repeals these other pensions.

Every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to go on record as to how he stands on this matter as I intend to place a discharge petition on the desk unless the Civil Service Committee reports my bill out.

I am glad to inform the House that I am receiving some splendid support for my measure. Certain persons in at least one important Government agency, namely the Securities Exchange Commission, have informed me that they are back of my bill 100 percent. That is patriotism for you. They are men who want to win this war and who show by their actions they want to win it.

Now let us see some of the other Government agencies demonstrate their patriotism.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, March 1, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent Mr. GEHRMANN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 39]

Arnold	Gavagan	Merritt
Bates, Mass.	Heffernan	Mitchell
Bender	Howell	Myers, Pa.
Bishop	Izac	Norton
Bolton	Jarman	O'Day
Bradley, Pa.	Jarrett	Osmer
Brooks	Jenks, N. H.	Ramsay
Buck	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson	Sasser
Byron	Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Camp	Kennedy	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Martin J.	Scrugham
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy	Shannon
Chapman	Michael J.	Sheridan
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Smith, Pa.
Creal	Kirwan	Stratton
Curtis	Kleberg	Sweeney
Douglas	Kramer	Tolan
Drewry	McCormack	Vreeland
Eberharter	McKeough	Walter
Englebright	Maas	West
Fitzgerald	Magnuson	Williams
Gale	Mason	Worley

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-five Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6709, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, is unavoidably absent on very important official business. He has asked me to stand by in his absence.

I have just been talking with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] about the bill that is presently before the committee. It is very earnestly hoped that it will be the pleasure and disposition of the committee to expedite consideration of this bill so that we may finish it today, even if it is necessary to sit a little late. I say that for this reason: We have laid out a very full program for the next couple of weeks. If this bill is finished today it is hoped to bring up the Rogers bill tomorrow, creating the Woman's Auxiliary Corps of the Army, and dispose of that. If that can be done, it probably will not be necessary to have a session on Saturday.

We have a very full 2 weeks following that, but if the schedule laid out can be carried out as planned, and unless something intervenes, it is hoped that it may



be possible to have perhaps 2 weeks' recess. Of course, that is entirely contingent upon two things: First, that we clear the calendar of all these important things; and, second, that something else does not intervene in the meantime.

I suggest that to show you that it is very important, if we can do it, to get through with this bill today. There are several controversial things in the bill over which we might argue for several days if we were of a mind to do so, but there have been a number of days' discussion on the bill already. Every phase of it has been discussed over and again many times, and it is the hope of the leadership, and concurred in by those gentlemen in charge of the bill, that we might proceed expeditiously today to consider carefully everything that is offered, but to use no more time than is necessary.

Mr. TARVER. I am certainly very much in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Virginia as to the desirability of our passing this bill today. I certainly think and believe that the Committee will be cooperative in shortening debate as much as may be practicable and endeavor to get through with it at a reasonable hour this evening. I shall not move to close debate at any time unless I believe an adequate opportunity for the discussion of the subject matter has been had. I do not, of course, expect the Committee will at all times agree with me.

With reference to the paragraph which has just been read, so far as I can ascertain only pro forma amendments will be offered. I have not heard of any amendment to be offered affecting the merits of the paragraph. I hope that as far as possible debate will be confined to the subject matter of the paragraph.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Affecting the merits of the paragraph?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe so.

Mr. TARVER. Very well.

I want to say before I finish, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] ranking Member on the Republican side, is cooperating in all of the efforts made to expedite consideration of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he intends to follow a uniform policy of objecting to all requests for extensions of time beyond the 5 minutes allowed under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. TARVER. I would not feel justified in doing that. If a Member is discussing an amendment of importance and asks an additional opportunity to express his views I would not feel warranted in objecting; but, as I said before, I shall insist that the discussion be confined to the subject matter of the amendment or the paragraph. In other words, I hope by making points of order to con-

fine discussion to the bill and to the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 79, line 11, after the period, add the following paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, \$40,000,000. Such sum shall be immediately available and shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purpose of such section."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California on the ground that there is no authority of law for making an appropriation in addition to the permanent appropriation made by section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. There is no legislative basis for the amendment which the gentleman offers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order, or will he not object if I move to strike out the last word at this point?

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman from California that while I would ordinarily have no objection to his talking concerning an amendment which could not be considered by the House, yet, in view of what has just been said before he took the floor with reference to expediting action on this bill, I shall be obliged to insist on the point of order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would remind the gentleman that this is the first time I have asked for the floor on this bill.

Mr. TARVER. I appreciate that fact. The gentleman can get the floor with reference to some other matter where his remarks would be pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, Mr. Chairman; I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the reason for offering this amendment which has just been ruled out I can explain in 5 minutes. I am seeking here to—

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to make a point of order against the gentleman's discussing the subject matter of an amendment which has just been ruled out of order. I would be glad, as far as I am concerned personally, to let the gentleman proceed for 5 minutes; but if I am to be consistent in

my efforts to confine discussion to the bill, I must now object to the gentleman's discussing an amendment which has been ruled out of order. I must insist that the gentleman's remarks be addressed to the matter pending.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am discussing the paragraph under consideration, to which I sought to offer an amendment.

Mr. TARVER. I addressed my remarks to the Chair, and, of course, will be subject to whatever ruling the Chair makes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am discussing section 32, the whole purpose of which has been through the years to bring together the products of our farmers and the people of our country who have had need of food. Particularly I want to talk about the school-lunch program.

My amendment was designed to make it possible to make this program at least meet the most serious undernourishment among the school children of America.

We are pursuing a policy of attempting to maintain farm prices at a parity level. But at the same time it is obviously true that certain sections of our population are not having the benefit of an increased income which other sections are getting and that, therefore, the ability of those groups of people to buy the food they need has been and is being sharply reduced. We are at the same time, and have already, provided \$1,800,000,000 for the purpose of lend-lease shipments of food to the people of other countries. This, I believe, was right. But can we at the same time fail to see that there is a basically adequate diet for the children of our own land? We are conducting a food-for-freedom program, in which we are asking our farmers to step up their production to the maximum amount they can produce. Inevitably there will be cases where some things are produced in greater quantity than can be moved across the sea or purchased in the ordinary manner here at home. There will then be problems in connection with the prices of certain commodities under those circumstances. And there should be a means of seeing that that food is moved to the places and the people where it is needed if we are to successfully combat undernourishment and disease and raise a strong, stalwart generation of American citizens. It would be different if this were beyond our power, but it is not. It would cost us only about \$60,000,000 to reach every undernourished child in America this year with a lunch every school day.

Most careful studies show that there are 9,000,000 undernourished children in America today.

#### GENERAL HERSHEY'S STATEMENT

General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, made the statement that 15 percent of all the men drafted for the Army had to be rejected because of malnutrition. Here is the statement he made at the National Nutrition Conference on May 27, 1941:

It has been estimated that perhaps one-third of the men rejected (for physical unfitness) was due either directly or indirectly to nutritional deficiencies. In terms of men the Army today has been deprived of 150,000 men who should be able to do duty as soldiers. This is 15 percent of the total number which have been physically examined by the Selective Service System.

It is perhaps of little use to speculate on what should have been done by our schools, by parents, by health bodies, or by the Government. . . . It is a condition we should recognize as dangerous and which we should take immediate, positive, and vigorous measures to correct.

I heard the Surgeon General of the United States only the other night state that this school-lunch program has been the most basically helpful step in improving the health of the American people that has been taken by our Nation.

I know there are a lot of things we cannot do during this war. I know there are many things we must and should go without. I know that many expenditures of government will have to be cut down, but I submit there is one basic policy we ought to pursue, and that is the policy of seeing to it that there shall be no malnutrition in our country at the present time, at least among the children. We could go a long way toward doing that even with this small amount that I attempted to offer in this amendment. If there is one thing most necessary to the strength of our Nation, most helpful in preventing tuberculosis and other diseases, it is a good diet for our children.

This program has been substantially cut by the committee to about \$92,000,000 less than we had last year. I hope some way may be found so that that amount can be restored before this bill is finally enacted. I agree thoroughly that we should help feed the people of England, who have suffered so much, but while we do that I think we must establish here a principle and policy of saying that there shall be no undernourishment of the children of America.

It would cost only \$20,000,000 to provide funds necessary to enable every one of these undernourished children to buy milk at 1 cent per half pint each day.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct when he says this bill has been reduced, but he must realize the committee has no authority to place money in the bill not authorized by law.

#### A PRINCIPLE FOR AMERICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should have stated that the net effect of what has happened in connection with this bill and the amount appropriated last year would be to give this program \$92,000,000 less than it had last year, which is perhaps a more accurate statement. The thing that will happen, of course, will be this: It will be the children of the poorer school districts that will have to go without these school lunches, not the well-to-do sections. For there can be no school-lunch program without local sponsorship. There have been about 80,000 schools participating in this program during the past year. Next year there

can be only about 40,000. The ones that will be left out, unless Congress corrects the matter, will be the very ones where the children need it most.

"No undernourished child in America." Here is a principle that the House ought to be thinking about, even if the amendment be subject to a point of order.

#### A GRASS-ROOTS BUSINESS

There is no extension of Federal bureaucracy, no Federal control, about this program. Briefly, the school-lunch program works this way: Commodities purchased by the Surplus Marketing Administration are allocated to State departments of welfare, who in turn allocate them to schools which certify that they have undernourished children in attendance. Whatever commodities are available are allotted to schools on the basis of the number of undernourished children, and these children are given free lunches. At the same time, every effort is made to have all children in the school served the same food, so that there is no discrimination whatever between the paying and nonpaying children. Local sponsors of the program, who may be boards of education, parent-teacher associations, or other public-spirited civic groups, furnish labor, equipment, and foods to supplement those furnished by the Surplus Marketing Administration. The children do not need to even know, and in many cases, I expect, do not know that the Federal Government is giving them anything. There is just a lunch, that is all, where there did not use to be any. No group of children is set apart from the rest. They all sit down together. Their parents who can afford it pay all or part of the cost. But all have the same meal, just as they have the same schooling.

Administration of the program is left entirely to the local sponsor. The Surplus Marketing Administration and State departments of welfare exercise only nominal supervision over the program to make sure that the food is properly utilized.

The Surplus Marketing Administration, I am told, is now besieged by anxious teachers, parents, and social workers who fear that under the emergency program Federal aid for school lunches will be curtailed or cut off completely. The tone of the letters leaves no doubt that lunch programs will have to be completely abandoned in many areas if this aid is denied.

Of course, the poorest communities, which are least able to do anything for themselves, will be the hardest hit.

I do not want to see this work curtailed; rather, I think because of our country facing what it does we must expand it to the point that there is not one hungry child in the land. One of the four freedoms for which we are fighting is freedom from want is it not?

We can establish freedom from want here in our own country for our children now. If we do, the dynamic effect of our action will, I can assure you, reach around the world.

Here is a letter written by a Missouri school teacher which everyone ought to read:

JANUARY 1941.

We feel that the hot-lunch program is one of the best things the State of Missouri has done for the children in many years. I find that my school children have gained from 3 to 10 pounds of flesh since we started about the 1st of September. This is my second year to sponsor the hot-lunch program and I find that it also helps attendance. Wish to say that our program is working perfectly and we are very grateful to the State of Missouri for it.

PEARL BEAL,

Teacher, Middle Smith School,  
District 104, Stoddard County, Mo.

Will Miss Beal's school be one of those left out next year? Notice she does not mention the Federal Government or the Department of Agriculture at all. She thanks the State of Missouri. I am glad she does.

#### WHAT OUR FARMERS HAVE A RIGHT TO EXPECT

Our farmers who are now engaged in this food-for-freedom program have a right to expect that we will not go back on our moral obligation to see that their prices do not collapse. And our people who face a rising living cost without any rise in income have a right to expect us to deal justly with them. So I plead for this policy of mine in order that we may do two things:

First. Provide adequate funds to make the price support effective.

Second. Provide for offsetting the disadvantages of the policy to groups caught by it—the low-income groups whose incomes are not improved by war.

Let us contrast our policy with that on the British Isles and in Canada. There the prices of foods are held down, in many cases frozen. Thus the low-income groups are not further disadvantaged. In the case of the British, meantime, subsidized consumption has been greatly expanded, especially in the case of children, made possible largely by our American lend-lease food. But the farmer's problem is recognized, too—a system of bonuses is provided to induce him to increase production, offsetting his higher costs and making it possible to utilize marginal areas. This provides a heavy burden on the Treasury—but it is a complete policy, a fair policy, both to farmers and disadvantaged consumers.

Meantime we in this country look a little foolish, it seems to me, helping—and justifiably—support school lunches and free school milk in England, Scotland, and Wales—and soon in Russia—without positively assuring ourselves of such a program at home.

The production increase on farms is going upward. Ships to move it to the British and Russians are short. We may be caught through the price-supporting program with large quantities bought with lend-lease funds which we cannot move, or, if ships are available, beyond what may be needed in some cases. We do not want to be caught, I am sure, with our warehouses jammed while kids and others are not properly fed because we do not have enough section 32 funds to move the charge from lend-lease account to section 32 account, from our lend-lease warehouses to the mouths of our own people who have need of it.

So, joined together, reasons for expanding the school lunch and school



milk program have their origin in (a) expanding farm production, (b) offsetting in part the disadvantage of our present incomplete policy, (c) the nutritional shortages of a third of our school population, (d) keeping our policy of feeding, as executed abroad under lend-lease, consistent in regard to our own food needy.

#### WHAT ENGLAND IS DOING

I would like to call to your attention the tremendous effort England is putting into her school-lunch program. England, of course, has long since passed through the period we are now in and has already reached the inescapable conclusion that nothing is more vital to the defense effort than an adequately fed civil population. I understand the Central Government of England is now subsidizing milk for school children up to 100 percent, and school lunches up to 95 percent of the total cost, and the announced policy of the Ministry of Food is to expand school lunches until all the 5,000,000 elementary and secondary school children in the country are included. In addition, school canteens are given larger allowances of the protective foods than are ordinary restaurants and cafes. If England, with her shortage of food, can do this, should we, with our tremendous stocks of food, consider reducing the little help we are now giving this important work?

#### OUR BASIC STRENGTH IS THE HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN

My amendment could do this: It could provide that the school-lunch program reach every one of the 9,000,000 undernourished children in America today.

Half the amount I have proposed would finance for 9,000,000 children a 1-cent milk program—so there could be one-half pint of milk, at a cost to them of 1 cent, for every undernourished child.

If this is not part of America's war effort, I do not know what is. If it is not fundamental to national strength, I do not know what is.

This is no social reform or experiment.

This is only a matter of the most fundamental of all measures to strengthen the fiber of our Nation, to protect our health, to do the one thing which more than all else and in place of many other things we cannot do now, will prove almost all by itself our sincerity when we say America's cause is the cause of the common people everywhere.

I am after a principle here. I admit that.

It is the principle of no undernourishment among America's children.

It can be realized.

And it never will cost so very much.

As we restrict the use of the things we should restrict and need to restrict, as we curtail other things that we can do without, as we learn to do without automobiles, to use less sugar, to pay higher taxes, let us establish this basic equality among America's school children—an equal right to a balanced meal once a day.

These children are the ones that will inherit the world that we are making now. They will come of age in a period when the whole world has been wracked by war and maybe by pestilence. Let us

give them a good start—a fair and equal start.

This is a great thing we can do—a truly great thing. And a very simple and understandable one.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100-1183), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as authorized by said act, \$47,462,910, to remain available until June 30, 1944

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: Page 79, beginning with line 13, strike out everything in the paragraph down through line 19.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important section that we are about to discuss; and, while I shall not decline to yield, I hope the membership will not interrupt me until I have finished my statement.

The amendment that I have offered may indicate that I disapprove this section being in the bill, but this is not true. I take the same position that the committee took—that is, that the House should review the problem—and I want to read the statement of the committee in the report on this section, as follows:

The committee has approved the Budget estimate of \$47,962,910 for the administration of the Sugar Act of 1937. The hearings disclosed there is in prospect a very pronounced shortage of sugar and that acreage and quota restrictions have been removed. The committee can see no sound reason for the continuance of this program of benefit payments to growers who are free to produce without restriction for a market in which the demand is certain to be substantially in excess of the supply for some time to come and would have stricken the item from the bill except for the recent action of Congress extending the act. The committee believes the legislation should be suspended under present conditions. Under these conditions, price-fixing legislation recently enacted may be so administered as to assure fair prices for sugar producers.

I cannot imagine, Mr. Chairman, much enthusiasm on the part of the committee to keep this section in the bill.

Let me show you just briefly the picture. You will find on page 161 of the hearings that Dr. Bernhardt testified that last year continental United States consumed about 8,000,000 tons of sugar. You will find on the same page that he testified that the estimated production of the Virgin Islands, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the continental United States for 1942 will be just a little more than 8,000,000 tons; in fact, about equal to what we used last year, and we have to provide our Allies with as much sugar as possible.

I do not think this item should be retained in the bill. I anticipated certain arguments that will be used against an attempt to strike it out, and I called up the Sugar Section of the Price Control

Administration and asked them what effect this amendment would have on the sugar situation. They told me it would tend to make prices rise and that perhaps Cuba would get some more benefits.

Let me read to you a part of section 2 (e) of the Price Control Act:

Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year \* \* \* he may make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon certain terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production.

I called this to the attention of Mr. Davis and Mr. Westering, of the Sugar Section, and they frankly admitted that under certain circumstances the price could now rise above what it is. When I mentioned this section to them, and said that they had authority to prevent this, they admitted that they did have authority to make subsidy payments, but said that this would require an appropriation. If it requires an appropriation later for subsidies, I shall not object to that, but I think that we are putting ourselves in a very peculiar situation here in projecting a \$48,000,000 item into the next fiscal year to pay benefits to the sugar growers.

Mr. Chairman, this seems a little paradoxical to me. Some time ago we had an overproduction of sugar and prices were down. This House passed the Sugar Act—I did not vote for it but the House passed it—for the purpose of keeping prices up and for the purpose of curtailing production. Now we find ourselves faced with a shortage of sugar and we are trying to increase production. I am told that we are going to use the same act and this same appropriation to increase production and at the same time keep prices down.

I think it is going to be very difficult for Members of this Congress to explain to the people of this Nation, to our constituents, when they begin to get their sugar-rationing cards for a half-pound or a pound of sugar a week, or maybe less—we do not know how much—and when they know that every one of the Allied nations are going to need all the sugar we can send to them, that our supply will be cut off, and perhaps we shall not have enough bottoms to ship the sugar here from Cuba, why we should project a \$48,000,000 benefit payment into the next year when not a cent of it has been contracted for and when we are trying to get increased production.

Mr. Chairman, I think this section should be stricken out, and save the taxpayers \$48,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I thought the chairman of the committee was going to limit the debate to 5 minutes on all amendments.

Mr. TARVER. I indicated in my statement that where important subject mat-

ters were being discussed and Members had not had an adequate opportunity to express themselves, I would not object to a reasonable extension.

Mr. RICH. Certainly I would not object to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is the most misunderstood item in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill. Not an ounce of sugar is raised in my congressional district, so I am speaking solely for the consumers of sugar and for the military protection of our country.

Last year we used in excess of 8,000,000 tons of sugar. The estimated normal consumption for this year is 6,800,000 tons. In addition, the estimated alcoholic need for explosives is for 1,300,000 tons. This makes our requirements a total of 8,100,000 tons of sugar.

The estimated available supply of sugar, counting an increase in the Cuban sugar crop of 1,000,000 tons and an estimated increase of 600,000 tons in the United States, approximates 7,100,000 tons. Thus, there is a difference between the consumption and alcohol-for-explosives estimates and the production estimate of 1,000,000 tons—a shortage of that amount.

Under the sugar and the price-fixing acts, the price of raw sugar has been fixed by the Price Administrator at \$3.74 per 100 pounds, and the price of refined sugar at \$5.45 per 100 pounds. The Cuban producer receives \$2.65, and with the tariff at 75 cents, and transportation of 34 cents the cost of Cuban sugar becomes the domestic cost. The difference between the refined price and the raw price is made up of a Federal tax of 50 cents per 100 pounds and refiners' charges of \$1.20. Permit me to remind the membership of the House that this tax imposed by the Sugar Act will yield about \$80,000,000 to the Treasury.

The Cuban sugar producers are paid \$2.65 under a contract that was made with them by the head of the Defense Supplies Corporation when the entire Cuban sugar crop was purchased. However, there is a clause in this contract that if the domestic price of sugar rises that contract is amended so that the Cuban sugar producers will receive the same price per 100 pounds as is paid producers in the United States.

That is the situation we find confronting us. Under the Sugar Act and the item of appropriation under consideration the American producer gets 80 cents per 100 pounds in addition to the \$2.65 plus the tariff readjustment. In other words the 80 cents per 100 pounds is a part of the price the American farmer receives for his sugar and is so considered by the Price Administrator in fixing the price of sugar at 110 percent of parity. If this section is stricken out of this bill and the Price Administrator has to raise the price of sugar in this country to make up the loss of these producer payments so as to encourage domestic production, then the sugar producers in Cuba receive

the price as fixed by the Price Administrator.

It is estimated Cuba will produce 3,000,000 tons of sugar. Even though the price should not go up more than the 80 cents per hundred pounds, this would amount to \$48,000,000, a straight-out gratuity to Cuban producers. Eighty cents per hundred pounds is the least it would be raised. Everybody knows that the price would be raised much more than that amount. It has been estimated at least double that amount, which would mean \$96,000,000 that we would vote as a gift to the producers of sugar in Cuba. The increased price sugar consumers would have to pay would not go to the producers; only a small part of it will ever reach them. Certainly they should receive a reasonable price—a living—if they plant sugar beets or cane rather than crops they have cultivated in the past. The hazards are too great, and they should not be expected to work at a loss. Furthermore, contracts have been made with producers providing consumer payments in pursuance of the provisions of the Sugar Act, and Congress should not attempt to abrogate these contracts.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Just let me finish and then I will yield.

It has been intimated on the floor of the House that some of our sugar producers will receive unusual benefits under this item. The largest sugar producer in this country produces about 100,000 tons of sugar. This producer does not receive 80 cents per hundred pounds but a lesser amount as the consumer payments go down with increased production, and in this instance it is 37 cents or even less. That concern would receive, under the allotments in this section, approximately \$700,000. But if the price of sugar goes up 2 cents a pound, which will certainly be the case, that concern will not lose but will receive at least three times the amount that is paid them now.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. Excuse me just one second, and then I will yield.

The saving of \$47,000,000 in this bill will be trifling compared to the increased costs to American sugar consumers. They will be taxed, through increased prices of sugar, not \$47,000,000 but three or perhaps four times that amount.

I appeal to you not to pursue a short-sighted policy under the guise of saving money, especially since we know that the results of our acts will be the placing of burdens of at least \$200,000,000 upon the people—the sugar-consuming public of the United States.

Farmers will produce all of the sugar needed for human consumption and for alcoholic needs for explosives if we will treat them fairly. Certainly this should be our policy if by so doing we save money to taxpayers and the Public Treasury.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH rose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to see if we can arrive at some basis as to limiting the time. I understood it

would be satisfactory to the minority side to close debate on this item at 1:45.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has not submitted any request yet.

Mr. RICH. I want to know how much time we are going to have on this.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think if we get through this in 35 minutes we will be doing very well.

Mr. TARVER. That is substantially the request I propose to offer. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock. We have already had 15 minutes of debate.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, and I do so for the purpose of suggesting to the Chairman that there probably has been no item in this bill of greater interest to the Members of this House and the consuming public of the country than the amendment which is now before us. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon asking anything of the Committee that will limit the debate unduly.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I am merely undertaking to serve the Committee, but from expressions I have had on both sides of the aisle I feel they think an additional 50 minutes for the discussion of this matter will be sufficient.

I move, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 61, noes 44.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. Boggs.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 55.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RICH. How much time am I to have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a cockeyed section in any bill or measure coming before the Congress, this is it. Just think of last year and for several years past paying the sugar farmers of this country if they did not raise sugar, both cane sugar and beet sugar—and you paid them millions of dollars—you now turn a somersault and under this crazy Department of Agriculture appropriation bill you pay the farmers for raising sugar. Where are you going? Does that make sense? To me it is just silly; it does not make sense. You say it makes money for the Government because you take more in than



you pay out. Who pays it in? All the sugar eaters, everybody, the taxpayers. Who gets it? The employees of the Government who are in the Department, the political leeches, and the sugar farmers. The sugar farmers do not want it. They want the privilege of raising more sugar; they want a tariff on imported sugar. There is a screw loose some place. You cannot get any better evidence that this bill ought to be licked than to read the statement of the committee on the Sugar Act on page 19. I will read that again:

The committee can see no sound reason for the continuance of this program of benefit payments to growers who are free to produce without restriction for a market in which the demand is certain to be substantially in excess of the supply for some time to come, and would have stricken the item from the bill except for the recent action of Congress extending the act.

The committee says that the sugar section ought to go out, but because you, the House of Representatives, voted to extend the act the Department wants to change from paying the farmers not to raise sugar to paying the farmers to raise sugar. Do you not think, in the House here, we ought to agree to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida? It is the only sensible, the only sane, the only wise thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. PAGÁN].

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to oppose to the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]. Such amendment is really vicious. If approved it would not result in any economy. On the contrary, it would be detrimental to the Federal Treasury, as it would kill the goose that lays the eggs of the processing taxes on sugar, as such amendment would practically dislocate and wreck the sugar industry.

There is some misunderstanding about the source from which these benefit payments are financed. These sugar payments in question are really paid by the sugar producers themselves, out of the processing taxes which they pay according with the present Sugar Act. On this matter, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, in a letter to Senator BYRD of Virginia, which appears in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, states the following:

In appraising the sugar program, one cannot lose sight of the fact that its expenditures are covered by a special one-half-cent-a-pound excise tax on sugar which not only pays all the costs of the program but has, during the past 3 years, shown a substantial net return to the Treasury. In other words, this program not only pays its own way but puts money in the Treasury besides.

This matter was also discussed fully at the hearings before the subcommittee on appropriations of the House. On this matter of the tax collections and the benefit payments, the following dialogue took place between the chairman of the subcommittee, the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and Dr. Bernhart, chief of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture. I will read from

volume 2, page 166, of the printed hearings about this legislation:

Mr. TARVER. How much was collected in excise taxes last year, Dr. Bernhart?

Dr. BERNHART. About \$68,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. How much was paid out in benefits?

Dr. BERNHART. About \$48,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. You only had an appropriation of \$47,962,000.

Mr. RHEA. The payments amounted to \$46,000,000 plus.

Dr. BERNHART. For this fiscal year 1941 there was collected approximately \$80,000,000, and \$46,000,000 was actually expended, leaving a net for the Treasury of \$34,000,000.

In Puerto Rico only, during the last 3 years 1939, 1940, and 1941, the processing taxes paid amounted to \$29,608,320 while the payments received by the sugar growers amounted to \$29,012,833, or about \$600,000 less than the taxes paid. So from Puerto Rico alone the Federal Treasury, in 3 years, had a profit of about \$600,000.

The Secretary of Agriculture, discussing further this matter in said letter to Senator BYRD, states the following referring to the proposed cut of the benefit payments:

Consequently, there would be a direct increase in cost to the Treasury on purchases of sugar and of the many food products containing sugar for the armed forces, as well as on purchases for our Allies under the lend-lease program. Moreover, the price of industrial alcohol, under wartime conditions, is determined by the price of sugar since so large a portion of our requirements is made from the sugar contained in molasses. Therefore, they would also have to pay increased prices for vast quantities of essential war materials.

As refers Puerto Rico, as well as other sugar-producing areas, if the benefit payments are cut, under the tax the sugar industry could not operate, it would not be profitable, it would have great losses, and would be discontinued and wrecked. And then, there would not be any processing taxes and the Federal Treasury would lose.

We would not object to the cutting of the benefit payments if the processing tax is repealed also, as well as other restrictions of the quota system. That would be fair. But we think that to collect the processing taxes and at the same time cutting the benefit payments, would be utterly unfair and, as the Secretary of Agriculture has stated, that would be deemed by many as an act of bad faith. It would also wreck and destroy a so necessary and important industry as the sugar industry.

I hope that the amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable misapprehension about this sugar amendment. In the first instance, when you speak about economy, you are speaking of saving something for someone. By the adoption of this measure no economy would result. On the other hand, it would cost the Treasury of the United States over \$33,000,000 a year, because at the present time the sugar program,

since 1937, has brought into the Treasury of the United States \$125,000,000 more than that which has been paid out in the form of benefit payments to growers. This results from a tax of 50 cents per 100 pounds, an excise tax, so that you can well see that economy will not result from this, but on the other hand it will cost the Treasury a considerable amount of money. These benefit payments are not paid for restrictive production. On the other hand, we must realize that today there is no restriction whatsoever placed upon the growers of sugarcane and sugar beets in this country.

In this time of war we need sugar more than ever, and to eliminate this appropriation would thoroughly discourage our farmers from planting more sugarcane and sugar beets and would only result in probable plantings of other crops, of which we now have a surplus and which the Government has been forced to purchase in the past for the protection of the farmer.

You may recall in December we voted for the extension of the Sugar Act by a vote of 134 to 32. Shall we now in just a few minutes destroy the months of consideration this legislation was given at that time? Shall we sabotage a program that has been carefully planned and thought out by our leading agriculturists and also discussed pro and con among Members of this House? The elimination of this item would not only do that but would also place a burden upon the domestic producers, as it would place them in direct competition with the cheap agricultural labor of Cuba, who now enjoys the benefits of a 75-cent tariff on sugar. It would have the effect of our consumers donating an additional \$75,000,000 a year to Cuba. Should this item be struck out, the immediate result would be that the price of sugar would rise to a probable prohibitive point to our consuming public at no benefit whatever to our sugar farmers.

Our sugar program embodies soil conservation, crop insurance, regulation of child labor, and assures the farmer justifiable prices for his crops so that he may compete with cheap foreign labor. It is a long-range program to protect the fertility of our land. It is a program to protect our children by regulating their hours of work in this industry. It is a program that in many instances insures a farmer from losses beyond the farmer's control.

It must be remembered that the sugar industry alone is paying for this program. It is financed by an excise tax placed on processors of sugar and other sugars imported to this country. It is not a tax upon the general public. This tax money goes into the general fund of the Treasury and is appropriated for the purposes provided for by the Sugar Act and is in effect a trust fund for the producers of sugar. Sugar not only pays its own way but also helps to swell the coffers of our Treasury. For the present fiscal year it is estimated that approximately \$80,000,000 will be collected in sugar taxes and only \$43,000,000 will be allotted to the sugar producers. This leaves a net profit of \$33,000,000 in the Treasury for other uses, so instead of

a burden to our Treasury, the sugar industry is a contributor. I might mention further that the Sugar Act is so written that it also adjusts differences in tariffs on sugar between Cuba and this country, as each time the Cuba sugar tariff has been lowered the Congress of the United States has consistently added in additional benefits under sugar legislation.

Let us not scuttle our sugar program. Let us not discourage our sugar farmers from expanding their production. Let us continue in the improvement of our sugar lands. Let us also continue protecting child labor in the sugar industry. We should rather encourage our farmers to plant more sugar, and the elimination of this item would certainly work to the contrary. I dare say it would throw the sugar industry into a state of chaotic confusion above which it may never rise again. I respectfully ask the membership of this Committee to vote against the amendment proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any question we consider here, unless it is the money question, that is any more complicated than the sugar question. I think it is ridiculous for me to try to discuss it in 2 minutes, or for the Committee to try to revise the Sugar Act in the course of a 50-minute debate. That reason alone it seems to me would justify us in voting down this amendment. Here is the situation. We have to pay the sugar producers of this country a certain return in order to induce them to grow sugar. In other words, you cannot produce sugar unless you assure the grower that he at least has a fair chance to break even on the proposition. Today we have a sugar shortage.

We can secure the maximum production of sugar in this country only if the growers are sure of a return that will enable them to stay in business. We can do that by either paying a higher price or by paying this subsidy. If you pay a higher price, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], we will be benefiting a large sugar-growing concern in Florida and also the sugar growers of Cuba and other foreign countries. They will get millions and millions of dollars more by reason of that high price. On the other hand, if we pay the subsidy, it will go to the domestic sugar producers, the farmers in this country.

The adoption of this amendment will not repeal the tax. Sugar consumers will continue to pay it at the rate of one-half cent per pound. It will still be reflected in the price. In addition, consumers will be forced to pay from \$80,000,000 to \$150,000,000 additional for sugar in order to give the farmer the same return that he is now receiving per ton of beets. The larger part of this increased cost will go to foreign producers, and to processors and dealers.

The public is irritated enough about sugar now. Rationing is not popular, although, of course, it is being accepted in good grace as a necessity. If we adopt this amendment, however, and increase

the cost of sugar to the consumer without justification in order to benefit a great corporation in Florida and producers in foreign countries, we cannot justify it to the American people. They will resent it and have just cause for resentment.

Let me point out in conclusion that if it is deemed desirable to discontinue payments, the President already has the power to suspend them under section 509 of the Sugar Act of 1937. We can always modify or repeal these provisions if it is wise to do so. Whatever is done, however, should be done only after careful consideration and not in this summary fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, there is little that I can say in 2 minutes on such a complicated subject. I want to impress on you this fact: If you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, you will get beans this year instead of sugar. The farmers of this country are now ready to plant their production of sugar beets, and unless they can be assured of this additional payment they will grow some other crop instead of sugar. You must understand that there is a price ceiling now on raw sugar of \$3.74 a hundred pounds, which is translated to \$5.45 on refined in New York City. Under the price-control law the growers were assured they would not be forced to sell their product below 110 percent of parity. These conditional payments are necessary, because of the price ceiling, to assure the grower cost of production. If this appropriation is knocked out, it means that the price ceiling must be raised, and that will cost the American public at least a cent a pound more. This will amount to more than \$100,000,000, and Cuba will get about \$60,000,000 of that. Why does Florida want this stricken out? The United States Sugar Corporation is the principal grower and processor in Florida. The 50-cents-per-hundredweight excise tax this company will pay on its expected 100,000-ton production will amount to \$1,000,000.

The conditional payment it gets back amounts to about \$720,000. This company wants to wipe out the Sugar Act. Florida may be able to produce sugar as cheaply as Cuba, but no other State can do it. By eliminating these payments and raising the price of sugar this company could increase their earnings by more than a million dollars.

This is an economy move to retain this appropriation. This sugar excise tax that has been levied on the industry has been bringing to the Federal Government \$20,000,000 a year more than has been paid out in conditional payments. Last year \$80,000,000 was raised from the excise tax, and the expenditures were \$46,000,000, leaving a net revenue of \$34,000,000 in the Federal Treasury.

I want to correct an erroneous statement that was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]. These payments are not being made to sugar

growers to cut down production. They are made to preserve the domestic sugar industry, to encourage production, and to insure a domestic supply of sugar at a fair price. It is unfortunate that more encouragement has not been given to domestic production in the past.

I have here a letter from Mr. Galbraith, Deputy Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, which outlines very forcibly the reasons why this appropriation is necessary. I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,  
WASHINGTON, D. C. March 7, 1942.  
The Honorable HARRY B. COFFEE,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. COFFEE: This will apprise you of the views of the Office of Price Administration with respect to the current discussions concerning the suspension of the tax and benefit provision of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended. The following facts are submitted to support our attitude.

1. The suspension of benefit payments to domestic producers would compel an increase in the price of sugar in order to maintain the 1919-29 average price or other applicable standards fixed in the Price Control Act of 1942. This increased price would of necessity apply to imported sugars as well as those domestically produced. The effect of such an increase in price would be an over-all increase in the country's sugar bill.

2. The price increase necessitated by suspension of benefit payments would produce a windfall profit to certain of the areas supplying sugar to this country.

3. An increase in the price of sugar would have the effect of increasing the price of alcohol which is produced in large part from molasses, since at the present time the molasses prices are directly related to the sugar price. The United States Government is currently purchasing between 60 and 70 percent of the alcohol manufactured in this country for the manufacture of munitions and other items directly related to our war effort.

4. The suspension of the excise tax on sugar would deprive the Federal Treasury of a source of revenue which during the past 4 years has averaged \$20,000,000 per year in excess of the amount paid to growers in the form of benefit payments.

In addition to the facts set forth above, I should like to point out that a prolonged consideration of the suspension of titles III and IV of the Sugar Act would have a detrimental effect on the planting of beet sugar for the 1942 crop year. Beets at the present time are being planted in the western parts of the United States, and any uncertainty with respect to prices to be realized upon the sale of these beets is certain to have an adverse effect on the planters' decision to grow beets. The discussion of the proposed suspension of the tax and benefit plan, furthermore, is likely to interfere with the free flow of sugar from offshore areas of supply. This would result because sellers in such areas would be inclined to withhold their sugar from this market while there was the prospect of a price increase which would occur not later than the latter part of August 1942, when 1942 beet sugar first moves to market.

I should like to emphasize that a price increase in sugar has an inflationary effect entirely out of proportion to the original increase in the price of the commodity itself. This is true because sugar is a commodity very widely used in the manufacture of almost every variety of food product in the country. The increased price of sugar, therefore, increases the cost of the processed articles, which, in turn, where percentage mark-ups are applied, further adds to the increase of prices to consumers.



I should like to point out that the sugar program carried out under the legislation of 1934 and subsequent acts has not resulted in a subsidy plan which burdened the consumers or the Public Treasury. At the time the Sugar Act of 1934 became effective the duty on Cuban sugar was reduced by an amount roughly corresponding to the excise tax levied on the manufacture of sugar. Thus, the consumers paid no more for sugar and the cost of the program was borne by the Treasury from a fund appropriated by Congress which was considerably less than the moneys provided by the levy of the tax.

The sugar program merely represents a redistribution of the income within the industry. The existing sugar program can be adapted with equal facility to the reduction or the expansion of acreage. When sugar is plentiful the payments can be made contingent upon the limitation of acreage. When sugar is scarce the payments can be made contingent upon the planting of a certain minimum acreage. This aspect of the sugar program was recognized when the Sugar Act of 1937 was extended on December 26, 1941, for at that time the rate of benefit payments was increased from 60 to 80 cents per hundred pounds of recoverable sugar. It was recognized at that time that the higher rate of benefit payment served as an added inducement to the growing of beet sugar without necessitating an over-all increase in the price of sugar.

These facts are respectfully submitted for your consideration, and if we can be of any further service to you, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

J. K. GALBRAITH,  
Deputy Administrator.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to say anything about this complicated sugar program in 2 minutes. I really prefer to say nothing, but I arise to correct some ideas that have been expressed which are not according to the facts in the situation.

As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEE] said, he and I both come from large sugar-producing areas. We know you are not paying more for sugar than you would have paid if you did not have this program. I do not agree with those who say that you will not have to pay more than 1 additional cent per pound for sugar. It is easy to stand here and say what is going to happen next year, but no man knows. My guess is that you may pay from three to five times as much for your sugar on your table if you vote for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. The processor is paying this tax. Someone will say, "Oh, the consumer does, too." All right. Then let us check the price of sugar during the period this Sugar Act has been in force, and you will find that we are getting the cheapest sugar on the face of the earth. These farmers cannot grow this sugar if we adopt this amendment. I can well imagine the confusion that will exist among the many farmers in this great beet-producing territory where we produce thousands of tons of sugar beets, if you adopt this amendment.

The proposal to strike out of the agricultural appropriation bill the appropriation for the administration of the Sugar Act is based upon a complete and dangerous misunderstanding of the realities of the situation. It is in direct conflict

with the policies of the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Production Board. It would require an increase in the ceiling price of sugar that would cost American consumers more than \$120,000,000 a year.

The argument for eliminating the appropriation, apparently, is based on the fallacious assumption that conditional payments are made by the Federal Government to sugar-beet and sugarcane growers only as a reward for limiting production, or, as it is often expressed, "for not growing sugar." Since no acreage limitations are to be imposed in 1942, the argument runs, the payments are no longer needed.

The fact of the matter is that conditional payments are not a reward for not growing sugar. They are paid to growers of sugar crops in consideration of their compliance with certain standards established by the Secretary of Agriculture. These standards require that no person under 14 years of age shall be employed in the production of the crop, and that all farm labor shall be paid fair and reasonable wages, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The grower must also comply with certain farming practices tending to improve the fertility of the soil and prevent erosion. The requirement that the grower shall not exceed his proportionate share of the total quota established for his area is only one of the conditions for payment.

The elimination of the appropriation would not benefit consumers. On the contrary, it would require an increase in the present ceiling price of sugar more than 1 cent a pound, which would mean a total annual burden on consumers—assuming a consumption of 6,000,000 tons—of \$120,000,000.

The necessity for increasing the ceiling price of sugar if the appropriation is eliminated arises from the following situation: The grower of sugarcane or sugar beets is paid for his crop by two sources: First, he receives a payment from the processor to whom he sells his cane or beets, and second, he receives a supplementary conditional payment from the Federal Government.

The Emergency Price Control Act provides that no ceiling shall be established for a farm commodity less than that sufficient to return 110 percent of parity to the farmer. The present ceiling price on sugar—\$3.74 a hundred pounds for raw cane sugar—is not sufficient, in the absence of the conditional payment made by the Federal Government, to get 110 percent of parity to the producer of sugar beets. The ceiling price, therefore, would have to be increased to make up the difference. The amount of the increase, as has been pointed out, would necessarily be more than 1 cent a pound.

Sugar is the first food to be rationed. As a matter of national policy every effort should be made to increase the production of sugar at home, where it is free of the war-time hazards of ocean shipping—at least during the emergency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the whole problem arises out

of the use of the quota system at the present time. The only reason they say there are no quotas is because they have estimated on the basis of a large consumption, but there has not been an Executive order yet signed suspending quotas. The cane growers of Florida have not yet been assured that if they prepare land and plant cane today, they will be allowed to harvest the stubble of that cane next year. Informally we have been told this, but no order as yet.

This Appropriation Committee says it should be suspended. The only reason it included this item in the bill is because on the same day of the passage of the so-called Congressional Pension Act, by suspension of the rules that day, you continued the quota system in this country. I have no fault to find with approaching honestly this subject, and assisting on a subsidy payment where needed. The beet growers in certain areas probably need that, and maybe cane growers, but it should be an honest long-range program so that they will be paid to raise something rather than a trick quota system in which you hold down production and the producers will not know from year to year what they are going to produce.

With reference to the amount that might be realized by the Sugar Co. of Florida, you will recall that on this floor, repeatedly, I called attention to the large benefit payments which they received for not producing. I proposed an amendment to the sugar law to reduce benefit payments to a maximum sum of \$2,500, and this was also advocated by the Sugar Co. before the Committee on Agriculture. In a few days the women of this Nation will stand in line for the purpose of getting a little stamp in order that they may buy sugar, yet they will know that there are vast areas in the West and vast areas in Florida in which additional sugar can be produced. We wrote the Secretary and told him that if we could be assured that they would allow us a market in the subsequent year we would produce 100,000 extra tons in Florida alone this year. The quota system which curtails production of a necessary food and national defense item is wrong. This appropriation is for the year 1943-44. If you will strike this item out, there will be plenty of time to write a fair and a sane sugar bill. We do not oppose help to the farmer. We do oppose a limitation of the production of sugar. You talk about Cuba. How do you know ships hauling sugar might not be diverted to other purposes? Strike out this paragraph and enable increased production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. It is unfortunate that debate was limited on this important piece of legislation, because today there is no more vital problem confronting our country than the so-called acute sugar shortage.

I have carefully read the hearings before the committee and I am appalled by the amount of misinformation which

exists upon the sugar issue. For instance, Dr. Bernhardt said that the beet-sugar industry was confronted on January 1, 1941, with stocks of approximately 1,700,000 short tons. That was at the beginning of 1941. Dr. Bernhardt also testified that about 15 months ago, the sugar section conferred with the Cuban Government and through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation financed the production of 400,000 tons of sugar, notwithstanding that huge surplus which we had in our country.

At the hearing he stated that this additional Cuban production turned out to be a very wise action, although it was very severely criticized at the time because there appeared to be such a great surplus in the market. Dr. Bernhardt did not call attention to the arbitrary reduction of 16.2 percent in the sugar-beet acreage in the United States during that same crop year of 1941, which, in reality, means that while our Government was encouraging greater production in Cuba, it was curtailing continental production. If it were wise to make 400,000 more tons of sugar available in Cuba, it would have been far more advisable to have permitted the sugar-beet producers of our country to operate without curtailment in 1941. We might just as well have had 350,000 or 400,000 tons more sugar produced by the beet industry here than was actually harvested in 1941, if there had been no acreage curtailment by the Department. This fact was pointed out by western Representatives more than a year ago, but their appeals were ignored by the Department of Agriculture, and sugar-beet acreage was cut from 979,000 to 820,000. In my district this arbitrary action forced the closing of one sugar-processing plant.

The shortage of sugar has resulted in consumer rationing, and appeals are now being made by the Department of Agriculture for increased sugar production in this country. If the benefit payments were eliminated at this time, it would have a detrimental effect on beet-sugar production, because farmers would divert acreage to the production of other crops for which there is as great a demand and the possibility of greater financial returns. In this emergency there is little justification for eliminating the benefit payments of the Sugar Act of 1937. The current sugar shortage partially results from the action of the Department of Agriculture in curtailing production of beet sugar during 1941.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fundamentally wrong, and every member of this Committee in order to protect the integrity of the legislative committees of this House should vote against it. The subject matter of this legislation was given serious and thoughtful consideration, and extensive hearings were had, and upon this careful work the great Committee on Agriculture practically unanimously reported out the legislation that

is now proposed by the gentleman from Florida to be stricken down without any consideration by the House.

Not only did the committee give this subject matter careful thought and consideration, but it was considered by the House and also by the Senate, and by a very substantial majority in both the House and the Senate this legislation was passed. Now, in all fairness to the thousands of people involved, would you Representatives be willing to strike down such legislation without first giving it more consideration than can possibly be given under the consideration that is being given this phase of this appropriation bill? Therefore, if for no other reason than this, the amendment should be rejected.

I am very glad, however, to advise this Committee that there are other and very cogent reasons to support this appropriation. For 8 years the legislation controlling the sugar beet and the sugarcane industry has been in operation, and this industry during that time has progressed and obtained a certain degree of stability. During this time the sugar-beet industry has increased 22 percent, and the sugarcane industry has increased 103 percent, and yet the price of sugar to the consumer has remained the same. This is one industry that does not take any money from the Federal Treasury. Last year this industry paid into the Treasury \$34,000,000, and will likely pay that much into the Treasury this year. Therefore, the striking out of this item in the bill does not save any money to the taxpayers, but it would take directly from them a profit of from thirty to forty millions of dollars.

Let us look at this legislation from the standpoint of fairness to the people involved. Last December a bill was approved which said to the farmer you can plant sugar beets and you can raise sugarcane, and for the sugar that you produce we will pay you a certain amount on each 100 pounds of sugar. Thereafter, and in January, the Price Administrator, Mr. Henderson, fixed the price at which sugar could be sold. The farmer relying on the good faith of his Government prepared the soil and made arrangements to plant the sugar beets and the sugarcane. Some farmers, especially in this true in California, have already planted their sugar beets. Others have done a great deal of the work which is necessarily involved in the planting of this crop. After this work has been done, now the gentleman from Florida by his amendment wants to say to these farmers that when we passed this bill last December, we were not acting in good faith, we did not mean what we said, and now we want to ask you as patriotic citizens to raise these beets and cultivate this sugarcane, but we have fixed the price of sugar so that it will be impossible for you to raise them without suffering a very distinct and decided loss.

It has been hoped that the sugar necessities of the domestic consumer might be met to a great extent by the increased production of beet sugar on lands irrigated under the vast irrigation projects of the West. It has been anticipated that this increased production would offset to some extent at least the depletion

of our sugar stocks brought about by the unprecedented demand which has been made upon sugarcane production for the manufacture of smokeless powder and other necessary articles of war and by large shipments of sugar destined for our Allies, particularly Great Britain and Russia.

You will recall that during the last war sugar sold for considerably over \$27 per hundredweight. Now the price is fixed at \$5.45 per hundredweight. You realize, of course, that we produce only 27 percent of our sugar. You also realize that the Secretary of Agriculture has taken all restrictions off so far as quotas are concerned. Therefore, the farmer can raise all the sugar beets he desires. The people in Florida and Louisiana can raise all the sugarcane they desire. There are no restrictions under this law. However, during these times, there are many agricultural crops under Government protection which even now compete with the profitability of a sugar crop, and it is certain that if this Congress repeals the Sugar Act at this time, which it would virtually do by adopting the proposed amendment, the farmers who have not already committed their land to sugar-beet production will unquestionably not plant sugar beets with the prospects held out to them under the adoption of this amendment. This would have serious consequences both in relation to our war efforts and to the welfare of the domestic consumer who within a short time will face a rationing of this essential food product.

We have provided that there shall be a tax of one-half cent per pound on every pound of sugar produced, which tax shall be applied first to the payments provided in this bill, and then any balance that remains in the Treasury can be applied for general purposes. During every year that this law has been in operation there has been a balance paid into the Treasury for general purposes, and as stated previously the balance for last year was \$34,000,000. Therefore, in the interests of economy and as a matter of just plain, common honesty between the Government and the farmer, this amendment should be defeated.

To permit such an amendment as this to pass would not only be a direct slap in the face of the great Committee on Agriculture that passed this legislation, it would be a violation of faith on the part of our Government and a wholly immoral act. But further than that, it would destroy one of the greatest industries of this country—the sugar industry—and would destroy it at a time when that important product is so vitally necessary to our very existence. Mr. Chairman, surely no member of this committee who understands the facts would be willing to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, the elimination of benefit payments to the American sugar producer would ruin the quota system entirely, because while payments are made to the growers, this is one appropriation that is justified, for the industry pays for itself. First, the Government collects from the sugar industry



nearly \$70,000,000, then refunds to the American producers something like \$47,000,000. This leaves a net profit in the Treasury of the United States of \$23,000,000.

The domestic sugar industry cannot stand the tax if the benefit payments are not made; and they are not really benefit payments in fact, because they are paid only to those producers who comply with the various provisions of the quota system. So I would say that if this amendment carried and this appropriation were eliminated from the current bill, the entire domestic sugar-quota system would break down and we should have to return to a system that, as has already been described by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] would cost the American sugar consumer about three times what it is costing him now.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, it has been ably demonstrated by the Members who have preceded me that this amendment is not offered as an economy move for two reasons: First, the processing tax produces revenue for the Federal Treasury; and second, were you to remove the benefit payments, you would indirectly tax the consumers of this country possibly in excess of \$200,000,000. Let us look at this move and call a spade a spade. This is actually a move by the Florida delegation to repeal the Sugar Act. The same fight was made in December and was lost because the Representatives of every other sugar-producing area fought the Florida group.

I say to you that it would be tragic in the course of 45 minutes' debate to repeal the Sugar Act, which is vital not only to the domestic economy of this country but in our foreign relations. This act is the result of many years' study. Do not forget that sugar is more directly tied up with our good-neighbor policy, our relationship with Cuba and other South and Central American nations than any other commodity. To repeal the benefit payments will be the signal for a complete readjustment of tariffs.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 2 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I believe none of the speakers has as yet given to the committee the reasons why the benefit payments were put into effect. If the Members will remember, when the Roosevelt administration came into power there was a tariff on sugar from Cuba of \$2.20 per 100 pounds. Everyone familiar with the sugar industry knows, of course, that at different times since then the tariff has been reduced until now it is only 75 cents per 100. Anyone who knows anything about the difference in the cost of producing sugar in Cuba and in the United States knows very well that the sugar producers of this country cannot compete with the low cost of operation in Cuba. They ought to know that the continental beet industry cannot survive without the ben-

efit payment while the tariff remains at its present level.

Mr. Chairman, sugar is the first food product to be rationed to the American consumer. It is the one food product which we can produce economically and satisfactorily, but which we are prohibited from producing to the point of properly protecting the consumers of the Nation in times of emergency. It is the first domestic agricultural product to carry an excise tax, one-half cent per pound. This is called a processing tax, and is collected from the industry. It was provided for the sole purpose of extending necessary benefit payments to sugar-growing farmers to encourage them to grow this product and to do this without adding to the burdens of the consuming or taxpaying public. The fact that the retail price of this product has been lower since this law was enacted indicates clearly that it constitutes no burden to anyone other than those from whom it is collected.

This tax last year amounted to more than \$80,000,000.

The bill before us provides \$47,500,000 of this money to be returned to the farmers who grew this crop, leaving \$32,500,000 in the Treasury for the general purposes of the Government. I propose to show that not \$1 of that \$80,000,000 tax is paid by the consumers of the Nation. Further, I propose to show that the existence of our domestic sugar industries is alone responsible for each year saving hundreds of millions of dollars to the housewives of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the situation as regards the production of beet sugar at this time is very similar to that which existed during and immediately following the first World War. The burden of feeding the armies and civil populations of our Allies then fell upon us. In those days they looked to us for everything. Our present Allies are now looking to us for everything, including sugar. Prices on food staples then were high. They are now high and will be higher later.

As compared to the growing of sugar beets, the growing of other food staples requires little hand labor. So when farm labor is scarce, as it was in that other war and is now, and when prices on all farm crops are high because of a continuing demand which exceeds the available supply, a considerable percentage of the beet-growing farmers turn to the growing of other crops which require less labor, especially if by so doing they can earn as much or more.

In those other days, for the reason I have set forth, the growing of sugar beets was greatly reduced, and it is interesting to study the effect upon the sugar market of that reduction and the increased cost of this important food product to the housewives of the Nation. For instance, in 1920 there was not enough beet sugar produced to have any other than a mere temporary effect upon the market. This sugar became available to the public in small quantities in October of that year. Because of the necessity of marketing this limited supply in order to promptly secure the money with which to pay the farmers for the beets, the sugar processors were compelled to dispose of the year's entire crop without delay.

Our cane-sugar producers were in a similar situation. When these two crops were absorbed it left the American people at the mercy of offshore producers, most of whom were located in Cuba.

Government records disclose the fact that in January 1920 the average retail price for sugar was 17.8 cents per pound. This increased month by month until in June the average price reached the hitherto unheard of peak of 26.7 cents per pound, and in many instances it was sold for more than 30 cents. In July it was 26.5 cents; in August, 22.9 cents; in September, 18.3. In October, when the beet sugar came on the market, the price dropped to 13.9 cents; in November to 12.8 cents; and in December, 10.5 cents. From 1920 on, as the farmers returned to the raising of sugar beets, the price to the consumer was consistently reduced until the decade of the thirties and since, when the price was the lowest of any such period during our entire national life.

*Actual retail price of sugar, 1920*

[Average price per pound, 19.4 cents]

	<i>Cents</i>
January.....	17.8
February.....	18.8
March.....	18.7
April.....	20.2
May.....	25.4
June.....	26.7
July.....	26.5
August.....	22.9
September.....	18.3
October.....	13.9
November.....	12.8
December.....	10.5

From Division of Retail Price Statistics, Department of Labor.

Mr. Chairman, for the years from 1931 to 1939 the records disclose that the average retail price per pound to the consumer for this most valuable food product was 5.42 cents. The difference between the price paid during this period and the average price of sugar for the year 1920, when domestic sugar was not to be had, and when the average price was 19.4 cents, is approximately 15 cents per pound. During that year, 4,554,000 tons, or 9,108,000,000 pounds, were consumed. If one will multiply that number of pounds by the 15-cent difference in the average price of sugar then and during the 9-year period I have mentioned, he will find that the American consumers during 1920 alone paid \$1,365,200,000 more than our housewives have been charged in recent years. This was possible only because during that and the previous year we did not have American beet and cane sugar industries sufficiently productive and stabilized to offer genuine competition to those who literally held up the American people when they were in a position to do so, and who would promptly do so again if an opportunity presented.

Mr. Chairman, on Saturday last I put into the RECORD the statistics of average sugar prices for the years 1913 to 1941, inclusive. They will be found beginning on page A889 of the Appendix of the RECORD. If the Members will give some attention to these figures, they will find that all down the years after our sugar-beet and cane industries became sufficiently developed to have an effect upon the market, the price of sugar to the

consumer has shown a reduction when the domestic sugar came on the market. Further, it will be noted that whenever the time came during the year when the limited sugar-beet crop disappeared from the market, the price to the consumers has advanced.

Mr. Chairman, if there were anything needed to prove to the Members of this House the importance of giving every possible encouragement to the production of domestic sugar, it is supplied by the information contained in the tables referred to. If conditions were such in 1920 that those living outside continental United States could so successfully jack up the price of this necessary food product to where the American people would be compelled to pay in 1 year approximately a billion and a quarter dollars more than they pay today, just what will happen to our people during the next few years if for any reason our farmers can be beguiled or driven from the raising of this commodity?

The fact that the price of sugar since the program of benefit payments for sugar growers was put into effect has been lower than it has ever been before and that sugar is the one commodity of which that can be said is definite proof that here is a tax that is not paid by the consuming public, but instead is paid by the industry itself, and last year netted the Treasury, after benefits were paid, the tidy sum of \$32,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is the time of the year when farmers are beginning to sign their acreage contracts with sugar-beet refiners. If word goes out to those farmers that this House has stricken from the bill the sum provided by law and approved by the committee for benefit payments, it will have an exceedingly unfortunate effect upon those farmers.

Representatives of the Agricultural Department at this time are in Michigan, and I suppose in other sections of the country where beets are grown, urging the farmers to put in all possible acreage for the white or navy bean, as well as other staple food products. Faced with a most difficult situation because of the scarcity of farm labor, our beet farmers do not need much encouragement to turn their activities and acres to other crops.

With farm production costs what they are, the beet-growing farmer cannot make a profit on his crop without receiving the benefit payments to which he is entitled under the law. The tax will be collected whether the benefit payments are made or not. If they are not made, the tax should be removed, as every Member will agree. In that event the Treasury will suffer a loss running into millions of dollars every year.

American housewives are already limited in the amount of sugar they can buy. They need every pound that can possibly be raised. Any curtailment whatsoever of our sugar production this year will mean an intensified problem where further rationing of this valuable product will be unavoidable. I hope the House will do nothing that will make an already bad situation much worse.

Certainly we ought not hamper or destroy an activity which results in putting into the Treasury a sizable sum of money each year and, in addition, pro-

tections the people of the United States from the foreign sugar gougers who will go effectively into price-raising action if and when the domestic industry is seriously affected. I most sincerely hope the committee will defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a table prepared by one of the Government departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to secure that permission in the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, for month after month we sat in the Committee on Agriculture and discussed the sugar situation. I do not believe that proper time could be given to it by the Subcommittee on Agriculture to such an extent that they should be able to report back here that this appropriation should be stricken out, thereby repealing the act we gave much serious attention and study.

This does not affect our domestic problem alone but it has a far reaching effect on our foreign policy. It has been ably demonstrated here that this amendment would not be an economy measure, but would cost the consuming public over 200 millions of dollars.

If you should by any chance agree to this amendment, I want to impress upon you that when these women, the housewives if you please, go down with their ration stamps and start buying a mere pittance of sugar at a price that will be outrageous, such as they paid during the last war and after the last war, you better reflect on what you do here today. The consuming public is willing to sacrifice but not where it is absolutely unnecessary. Vote down this amendment and give the housewife sugar at a reasonable price such as she has had since the enactment of the Sugar Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'Connor].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to go into the merits of this amendment. I want to point out to you that the Congress of the United States has already committed itself to the payment of these benefit payments. Let us not undermine the faith that the American farmers and the American beet growers have in the Congress of the United States, by now refusing to go through with the commitment. It would not be fair to them and it is not fair to ourselves.

May I point out that these benefit payments are not only made to farmers for producing the sugar but are made on certain conditions. What are those conditions? First, the producers must agree to take care of the soil, which is vital. Second, the producers must agree to pay a certain standard of wages, and surely that is important. Not a single Member of this House wishes to see labor working in the beet and cane fields for a few cents a day. Third, the producers must agree not to use child labor, and no Member of the House wants child labor used in the production of beets or cane

either. Under the terms of the Sugar Act all of these conditions must be complied with.

The sugar program was established several years ago by an act of Congress known as the Sugar Act and it has been renewed from time to time and just last December again renewed. It is an established policy. The province of the Appropriations Committee, as I view it, is to appropriate money to carry on the various agencies and expenses of the Government as provided for by law. In other words, it is really not a legislative committee. For the Congress today to change the Sugar Act in an appropriation bill by refusing to appropriate would seem to me to be a direct repudiation of the Sugar Act as extended and in effect a repudiation of the contract made with the beet and cane growers of the country. If we were to do that here today by adopting this amendment the sugar producer of the United States will no longer have any faith in the Congress and could not, with safety, after an act of Congress was passed, rely and plan and proceed thereunder.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Sanders].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, one of the gentlemen engaged in making this unfortunate attack upon the American sugar farmer characterized the sugar program as cockeyed. If there is anything that is more cockeyed than this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Florida, I fail to see what it is. At the very time when sugar is needed as never before in our history, not only for food but for alcohol and for explosives, this Congress is asked to adopt a policy of discouragement to the American sugar farmers and to tell them that they alone among the farmers are going to be singled out as the ones that we will not give encouragement to, and to say to them, in effect, that "You shall not be incorporated into the American farm program." This is, to my mind, the very height of absurdity.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that upon such short notice no amendment offered in such manner will be adopted.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Is it not true that if we adopt this amendment we would be going altogether contrary to the program on the part of the Government to hold down prices for the consumer?

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

This suggestion is based upon a lack of understanding of the problem. In fact, nothing would be more disastrous to the public, both taxpayers and consumers, than for such action.

For years we who have made a study of our sugar problem have warned the Members of this Congress and the American public of the disastrous situation that we would face if our continental sugar farming industry should be permitted to be destroyed. This present war emphasizes our arguments for the



very shortage of water transportation which we foretold is causing the consuming public to depend more and more upon the continental sugar growers.

American public opinion and simple justice would both require that the American sugar farmer, like other farmers, should receive not less than parity. Under the terms of the Price Control Act, if parity payments are withheld from sugar farmers, the Price Administration would have to raise the ceiling sufficiently to make up the difference. Inasmuch as the Sugar Act actually leaves a surplus in the United States Treasury, the result of cutting out parity payments to sugar farmers would not be a saving to the public but would actually cost the public more money.

The present sugar shortage and the prospect of sugar rationing makes it absolutely necessary that the production of sugar in the continental United States be encouraged and this is the obvious purpose of the parity payments.

The average annual consumption of sugar in the United States is assumed to be around 6,000,000 tons. If the price of sugar should be increased from 80 cents to \$1.50 per hundredweight, the annual increase of the consuming public would amount to from one hundred million to one hundred and eighty million dollars per year. This increase would go largely to Cuban producers and a few corporations who control the market of offshore sugar. The net result would be to increase the cost to the public and to transfer the benefits now received by the United States continental sugar farmers to Cuban producers and to certain large American corporations.

Parity payments should be continued in justice to the consuming public and to the sugar farmers alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the amendment as offered by my colleague from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]. I have no fault to find with the zeal of my colleagues from the beet-growing States. I can appreciate their problems, and it has been my contention for many years that legislation can and should be worked out which will give the payments to and production to the sugar-beet growers of our country and at the same time permit unlimited sugarcane production in Florida and other States.

It is absurd for the Federal Government to restrict sugarcane production in the State of Florida, particularly during a war sugar shortage. Continental United States produces only about 30 percent of our Nation's requirements. After we obtained the usual quantity from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands all combined we still produce only about 55 percent of our Nation's sugar requirements. We formerly received some 15 percent of our Nation's requirements from the Philippine Islands; however, it is obvious that we cannot expect to receive under war conditions any appreciable amount of sugar from the Philippine Islands. Neither can we depend fully upon sugar from Cuba. It is im-

perative that we produce every possible pound within the continental United States and insofar as possible in this matter supply our domestic needs.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] has stressed his belief that if the Hendricks amendment is adopted that the price of sugar in the United States will increase. This is not necessarily the case, because we have passed a price-control law, the Honorable Leon Henderson has been appointed Price Administrator and, I believe that we can depend upon him to protect the American consumer in any attempted unjust sugar price increase.

It is impossible to discuss this subject in time so limited, but I sincerely urge my colleagues to accept Florida's amendment.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 6541, for the repeal of the sugar quota system insofar as sugarcane production in the continental United States is concerned. The acceptance of the Hendricks amendment will, in a way, be a substitute for this bill. We in Florida are determined to expand sugarcane production in our Florida Everglades section. This is probably the finest sugar-producing land in the world, and it is all too plain that more sugar is needed. And may I remind my colleagues that the sugar rationing plan is now ready for enforcement, and it is your duty, and my duty, to relieve the situation all we can. The best relief that I know of is to repeal the silly sugarcane production restriction in the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope Members present understand what they are doing if they vote this amendment to the bill. The pending amendment would strike from this bill the appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended so recently as last December. This amendment, if adopted would make impossible the continuance of the sugar policy which was adopted in 1937 and has worked very well during 4½ years. As has been pointed out by other speakers, if this amendment should be adopted, the cost of sugar would be raised and the shortage of sugar would be increased. Unless the sugar-beet farmers know what to expect, they just will not grow sugar beets; they will grow other agricultural commodities. I make an appeal to you, and each of you who I hope credit my sincerity, that you defeat this amendment. It will have a very bad effect on the principal industry in our State of Colorado, which is the sugar-beet industry.

TEXT OF WICKARD LETTER TO SENATOR BYRD CONCERNING SUGAR PAYMENTS MADE PUBLIC

The Department of Agriculture under date of March 9, 1942, made public the following letter from Secretary Claude R. Wickard to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, in response to the Senator's letter of March 6, 1942. In this letter Secretary Wickard answers criticisms and objections made to the Sugar Act.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,

United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of March 6, 1942, with respect to the pending appropriation of \$47,962,910 for payments to sugar-beet and sugarcane producers under the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended. You are of the opinion that the proposed expenditures represent in their entirety a drain on the Treasury, constitute nonessential spending, are made primarily for reducing production, and provide for unjustified payments to large producers. You therefore ask that this Department "make no contracts for these benefit payments until Congress has had an opportunity to review the sugar-control legislation."

We are in full accord with your objective to eliminate nonessential Federal expenditures. But in this instance, the facts are, as I shall explain in some detail, that the elimination of the 1942 crop payments may actually result in a greater net outlay of Treasury funds; would preclude continuation of important social measures; would unquestionably reduce 1942 plantings in the beet area; and would necessitate a tremendous toll from consumers, a large portion of which would provide a huge and inflationary "wind-fall" for foreign producers and much of which would accrue to large domestic producers. Moreover, any commitment made to producers with respect to 1942 payments arises out of congressional action of late December 1941 and not from any contracts entered into by this Department.

If the conditional payments authorized by the Sugar Act are not made, it would be necessary, under the Emergency Price Control Act, to increase the ceiling price for sugar at least 80 cents per hundredweight after 1942 crop sugar becomes available. This minimum increase would meet the requirements of that act only in the event that revisions in the purchase contracts, under which growers market their sugar beets and sugarcane, could be made in a manner so as to give growers the total amount of the ceiling price increase. Should no revision in contracts be made, an increase in the ceiling price of as much as \$1.50 per 100 pounds would be necessary. Consequently, there would be a direct increase in cost to the Treasury on purchases of sugar and of the many food products containing sugar for the armed forces, as well as on purchases for our Allies under the lend-lease program. Moreover, the price of industrial alcohol, under wartime conditions, is determined by the price of sugar since so large a portion of our requirements is made from the sugar contained in molasses. Therefore they would also have to pay increased prices for vast quantities of essential war materials requiring the use of industrial alcohol (explosives, antifreeze, plastics, lacquers, solvents, etc.).

Furthermore, the excise tax on sugar provided for in the sugar legislation is part of a comprehensive program for dealing with the problems of the sugar industry which was recommended by the President in 1934, and again in 1937. In the absence of conditional payments to producers, it is doubtful whether the continuation of the tax on this one food commodity could be justified. In fact, the continuance of the tax under such conditions would be deemed by many an act of bad faith. Repeal of the tax would result in a loss to the Treasury of collections which have averaged \$74,000,000 in the last 3 fiscal years. In appraising the sugar program, one cannot lose sight of the fact that its expenditures are covered by a special one-half-cent a pound excise tax on sugar which not only pays all the costs of the program but has, during the past 3 years, shown a substantial net return to the Treasury. In other words, this program not only pays its own way but puts money into the Treasury besides.

The objectives of the legislation of effecting a relatively just distribution of the income of the industry as between grower, processor, and laborer, of preventing child labor, and of conserving the soil—all of which objectives are attained through the tax and conditional payment provisions—may not appear to some as a valid basis for continuing this appropriation. However, there are many large groups of citizens who are vitally interested in these objectives. Various public agencies who have investigated these matters have commended the results of the program, the most recent instance in point being the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Inter-State Migration of Destitute Citizens (77th Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. No. 169), which refers with approval to the safeguarding of higher labor standards in the sugar program. It should also be pointed out that the Congress, on three occasions within the past 8 years, after thorough investigation by appropriate congressional committees of the contentious issues involved in sugar legislation, has endorsed these objectives by reenactment of the legislation.

It cannot be stated too emphatically that failure to make this appropriation would have a serious effect on beet-sugar production in this country this year. Although it may eventually be explained to the great majority of beet growers that the loss in Government payments would be made up by increased sugar prices to consumers, the immediate effect of the failure to appropriate would be to cause considerable confusion and uncertainty among beet growers today when planting is just getting under way and would unquestionably lead many growers to curtail, if not cease, planting beets.

It is true that it was found necessary under the provisions of the act to curtail somewhat 1941 beet acreage with respect to which payments were to be made, because of the pressure of record carry-over stocks in that area, as well as of large stocks in other areas supplying the United States market. Since most of the sugar-beet acreage is planted in the spring months and a decision had to be made before planting, 7 months prior to "Pearl Harbor," anticipatory judgments of possible developments in the far-eastern situation could not have been taken into consideration. However, it is usually overlooked that domestic sugar production, particularly in the continental beet and cane areas, has increased very greatly under the sugar programs. For example, the crops of 1938 to 1941, inclusive, produced in the continental beet and cane areas averaged 22 and 103 percent, respectively, above the last four crops grown in these areas immediately prior to the sugar programs.

On the assumption of a 6,000,000-ton consumption, an increase of from 80 cents to \$1.50 per hundredweight in the ceiling price would increase the annual consumer cost of sugar by \$100,000,000 to \$180,000,000 per year. In addition, the cost of industrial alcohol would increase by \$35,000,000 to \$65,000,000 per year if the present relationship between the price of sugar and alcohol continues. The increased levy on consumers would create an inflationary windfall of from \$60,000,000 to \$110,000,000 per annum for foreign producers. It would also permit certain large firms engaged in the production of domestic sugar to receive very substantial increases in income. For example, a producer making 100,000 tons of raw sugar would receive, if the appropriation were made and the condition for payment met, payments of \$720,000. In lieu of such payments the indicated increase in ceiling price would result in an additional income ranging from \$1,600,000 to \$3,000,000 or \$880,000 to \$2,280,000 in excess of that obtained under the payment program. Furthermore, if the Congress fails to make this appropriation and the revisions in the purchase contracts referred to earlier

are not made, processors of sugar beets and sugarcane would enjoy exorbitant returns.

With respect to your request that we make no contracts for these conditional payments, we wish to inform you that no contracts are provided for under the Sugar Act of 1937. The act merely authorizes the Secretary to make payments to producers upon fulfillment of the conditions specified in the act itself. You will recall that there was extended debate in the Senate in December of 1941 when extension of the act was under consideration. This debate covered in part the same issues to which you now refer and the amendments you then proposed were rejected by the Senate. Many farmers in the sugar-beet producing area, relying upon this action taken by Congress, have made arrangements for planting and in some instances have completed planting the 1942 crop.

In pointing out that the failure to make this appropriation will create several serious public problems and will not alleviate the Treasury position, this Department does not disregard the large returns for a number of individuals or corporations which may result from this or any other agricultural program. The Department has advised the Congress heretofore that under any method of protection to producers, whether such protection takes the visible form of direct payments with Federal conditions attached or the invisible form without Federal conditions, some producers, whether they be small or large, whether they be individuals, partnerships, or corporations, will make large returns. This problem is primarily part of the general national problem of working out equitable tax legislation with respect to excess earnings.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,  
Secretary of Agriculture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MCINTYRE].

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, I feel from the indications we see that, unless the provisions are retained in this bill as they are written, we are going to have many farmers who ordinarily produce sugar that will not be producing it this coming season.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact that if these payments are not provided for; in other words, if this amendment prevails, many of the gentlemen's beet growers in Wyoming will proceed to raise wheat instead of beets?

Mr. MCINTYRE. That is absolutely correct. We need the sugar and need it badly at this time, too.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is opposed to the violation of the contract made between the Congress of the United States and the American beet grower when the Congress passed the law providing for the payment of these benefit payments?

Mr. MCINTYRE. I feel that is involved; yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. May I say that I have a letter here from the Office of the Price Administrator which I did not have time to read, but which I shall

ask permission to place in the RECORD. It is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, thousands of acres are already planted or about to be planted to sugar beets. They are already prepared in California and in my State, under a direct contract with this Congress, that the Government would pay so many cents per hundred pounds, depending on the sugar content. Do you propose to violate a contract? Our colleagues from Florida do not want to do that. I sympathize with them and would like to curtail foreign imports to increase Florida's quota, but do not turn down a contract. Think of it! That is what our enemies would do. We cannot afford it. We must appropriate this money.

This is not a drain on the Treasury. Remember that in the first 4 years \$87,000,000 more was collected from the processors of sugar than was paid back to the growers. In this year there will be many millions collected from the processor that will be paid back to the growers. Let us not start in by repudiating a contract. Let us vote down the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be a sugar expert but I do recall that on May 1, 1920, I went to work for a wholesale grocery house. I recall very well that the wholesale price of sugar on that date was \$20.32 per hundred pounds. They sold only to their regular customers. I saw storekeepers refused sugar because the quantity available was so limited the jobber could sell only to its very best customers. Surely we do not want to see a recurrence of such a situation.

I think the sugar policy of this country is pretty well established. The Secretary of Agriculture has expressed himself as being in favor of continuing the present sugar program. It is true that the sugar-beet farmers are about to plant their crop for this year. Next to tires, I think perhaps the sugar problem is the most acute in this country. None will deny it is one of the most serious problems now facing the American people. Certainly we do not want to do anything now which will upset our sugar production. Our farmers should be encouraged to plant more sugar beets than ever before.

In the very short time allotted it is of course impossible to go into the sugar problem in detail, but I am sure the gentlemen who have preceded me have convinced you that this amendment should be defeated and that the sugar program should be left as it is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.



The situation of the sugar producers in this country is not entirely of their own choosing. They are subject to a policy that was adopted by the Government, a policy for which they perhaps would have preferred another policy—that of a protective tariff. The policy of subsidization in lieu of a protective tariff was adopted on the theory that the consumers of the country would get cheaper sugar by subsidizing that minor part of our sugar produced at home, rather than by paying a tariff and a higher price on all the total consumption of the United States. Who will now say that the development of a domestic-sugar industry is not worth what it costs?

Let me emphasize the point made by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]. Before this legislation was passed in December, on account of the concern of the beet growers in California, I went to the members of the committee and to the Department of Agriculture, urging prompt action to determine the policy, so that our growers would know whether or not, and under what conditions, they could plant their beets. On the faith of that act passed in December our growers have been preparing for this year's production. Their planting is now well advanced in our State in reliance on the policy adopted by Congress in that act. The action proposed here would be a repudiation of what Congress did in December.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the pending controversy over sugar has been rather well ventilated, and I want to submit a few rather incidental facts since the question of alcohol has been discussed on the floor in recent days.

One million two hundred thousand tons of molasses from the Cuba crop have been earmarked for the production of alcohol. I am hopeful that that amount can probably be reduced to 600,000 tons or less. On the 13th of August 1941 the Secretary of Agriculture announced the availability of 20,000,000 bushels of Commodity Credit Corporation corn for conversion into alcohol. On the 15th of January of this year the Commodity Credit Corporation had actually worked out a plan for making available corn at 85 cents per bushel delivered to the distillery and expressed the hope that probably 60,000,000 bushels of corn could be converted into alcohol in 1942. On the 27th of January 1942 the Commodity Credit Corporation offered wheat for conversion into alcohol at a delivered price of 91 cents a bushel. It is therefore plain that the Secretary of Agriculture is making some effort to diminish the amount of molasses that must be converted into alcohol and, proportionately, increase the availability of grain for that purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any gentleman who wishes recognition at this time?

Mr. HENDRICKS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], a member of the committee, is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say a few words about this matter before we voted on it.

I heard one of the Members say that this was purely a Florida affair. Well, if it were, we would be perfectly justified in offering this amendment because in this whole sugar program Florida has been coming out of the little end of the horn. But it is not a Florida affair, let me assure you of that. If you want evidence that it is not a Florida affair, take the committee report and poll the members of the Appropriations Committee and see what they thought about it. I can tell you, frankly, that there was every possibility that this amendment might have been adopted in the committee had it been offered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Not at the present time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Why not go to the members of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am not yielding until I have finished my statement.

However, I did not intend to offer it there because I felt the House ought to have an opportunity to act on this because they had passed the Sugar Act.

Then we hear so many people say that this money is obligated. To those who think this money is obligated, I want to refer to the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the gentleman from Virginia on the other side of the Capitol in which he said this money is not obligated and that there are no contracts under this money.

This is a \$48,000,000 appropriation projected into the next fiscal year to pay the growers' benefits for sugar. We passed a Sugar Act here based on overproduction and low prices. We did it to bring up prices and curtail production. Now we have a shortage of production, and you say that we are going to use the same act to increase production and keep down prices. This seems a bit paradoxical to me.

Then we talk about the revenue the Treasury would lose. Do not worry about the Treasury losing any revenue. When the Ways and Means Committee gets through with this tax bill everything in this country is going to be taxed.

I now want to go back for a moment to say to you that this sugar problem is not a Florida problem. It is not a problem that we are selfish about. But when people begin to get these stamps for sugar, then it is going to be a proposition affecting every boy and girl and man and woman in this country.

We enacted this act on December 1 of this year, and every representation made by sugar growers in this country was

made before Pearl Harbor. I do not want you to forget that. I want you to remember this one thing. When you say that the sugar growers will not produce sugar I want to remind you that we grow oranges in the State of Florida. If the Government will tell me that there is a shortage of oranges and we need all the oranges we can produce, I will go and buy a grove myself to help furnish oranges. I am sure the sugar producers of this country, with the Government telling them we need all the sugar we can get, not only for ourselves but for our Army and our Allied nations, will continue to produce and increase production of sugar.

None of this is contracted for. We can handle the question by a subsidy. We can take care of the sugar situation. I am sure if you take the bridle off of these people they will produce. I am sure the people of Florida will produce sugarcane in large amounts, but they are not going to plant sugarcane realizing there is a quota on it and they cannot get anything out of their first crop, but must be permitted to cut their stubble for 4 or 5 years. They cannot do this under the Sugar Act.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment ought to be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501-1518 and 55 Stat. 255-256), \$8,572,954, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 79, line 20, strike out line 20 with the balance of the paragraph down to and including line 3 on page 80.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get a picture of the operations of this Corporation clearly before us. Prior to July 1, 1941, the Corporation had been operating for 3 years. During that 3 years it had had appropriated for administrative expenses approximately, but not quite, \$17,000,000. The figure of \$31,000,000 which my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated as the total amount appropriated for administrative expenses not only included the appropriation for

the present fiscal year, the results of the operation during this fiscal year not yet being available, but it also included the appropriation for the fiscal year 1941 twice, because he evidently copied from the bill book the figures for 1941, which were twice stated in that column. Only approximately \$17,000,000, slightly less than that amount, has been appropriated for the fiscal years ending July 1, 1941. During that 3-year period, when operations were confined to wheat, the losses sustained by the Corporation over and above premiums which were received were approximately 18,000,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TARVER. I do.

Mr. HOPE. It is true also, is it not, that during the first 2 years that this Corporation operated in the insurance of wheat there were years of drought out in the great wheat-growing sections of this country, when the loss was much greater than might be anticipated in normal years?

Mr. TARVER. Undoubtedly these years during which the Corporation has operated in wheat have been very unfavorable crop years for wheat, at least insofar as 2 of those years are concerned. The officials of the Corporation feel that the feasibility of an operation of this character should not be tested by 2 or 3 years, but that a considerable period of time is necessary in order to determine whether or not the plan as originally conceived might be carried out.

Only last year the operations of the Corporation were extended, by act of Congress, to include insurance of cotton. Of course, I come from a cotton-producing section of the country and I supported that legislation upon the theory that if the wheat producers were to receive the benefits of this program, the cotton producers should also be included. But I want to be perfectly frank with you as to my opinion and as to the opinion of the majority of the committee. You have heard the report quoted to you by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the course of his argument. I wish that I were able to entertain the belief that the operations of this crop-insurance plan would eventually be shown to be successful. I think it would be a fine thing if some method could be provided by which the farmers of the country might be protected against seasonal losses occasioned by drought or by insects or from whatever other cause, so as to insure to them reasonably stable income. I think it is a fine idea and a very fine objective. I am one of those who does not believe that that objective will be attained.

I do not believe this crop-insurance program is going to work out, but at the same time I do not think you ought to undertake to abandon it by eliminating this appropriation from an appropriation bill. If you do this, you ignore the contracts that the Corporation has entered into with the wheat and cotton growers of the country and which they had the right to anticipate would be carried out by the Government. The committee in

its report indicated that, in its opinion, if during the next year or so it is not demonstrated that this crop-insurance plan is workable the Congress should give consideration to the elimination of the plan by appropriate legislation; but do not do it by withholding funds in an appropriation bill for an authorized purpose. If it is to be abolished, the Committee on Agriculture should consider legislation to liquidate the obligations of the Government in connection with the program and to wind it up in an orderly way. I certainly hope, despite my fears, that the program will be made to carry out effectively the objective which Congress had in mind in instituting it. The House should not, in the middle of a season of operation of the Corporation, when it has entered into contracts with hundreds of thousands of growers of wheat and cotton in the country, undertake at one fell swoop to simply cut out all of the money carried in the bill for carrying on this work. It ought to be done, if it is done at all, after careful study by the Committee on Agriculture and in an orderly way.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I think it is pitiful to see members of the Appropriations Committee come upon the floor of the House attempting to legislate in connection with agriculture problems on an appropriation bill. This insurance proposition was gone into fully by the Committee on Agriculture.

The Government today has thousands of contracts with wheat growers, and this year they are entering into contracts with cotton growers. I may state to the gentleman from Illinois that during the period it has been operating they have made a better showing than any private insurance company has been able to show in a similar period. Our committee studied insurance operation over a stretch of 5 to 7 years in connection with operations of various private insurance companies, working down to a definite and fair program. Private companies were unable to make as good a showing during their first year's experience as this Government insurance experiment has made.

Certainly we are going to have some losses, but I say to you this is one program that is going to be the salvation of thousands of farmers who are going to be put out of business and who have been put out of business prior to this program because of various losses for reasons they are not responsible for. This last year in my State, South Carolina, we had over a 60-percent loss in the cotton production. I venture to say that thousands of good, clean, honest farmers who want to remain on the farm are drifting away from the farm because they had no protection of insurance.

A special committee of the House is investigating migration. I will tell you one of the reasons people are migrating from the farm: It is because they are not in position to do those things and get those things that every other group you can mention are getting today. It is very

easy for this Congress to take care of practically every other group in anything they might want, but when it comes to agriculture they must work out their own salvation. All we ask is 2 to 5 years of experiment to work out and perfect what I believe will be the salvation of the farmer. Then we find someone coming in who does not, perhaps, receive any benefits in his district under this program, and who may be personally against it, asking this Congress to legislate on an appropriation bill and wipe out the whole program.

Prior to the time we had this insurance we had to pay millions to farmers because of losses where they were unable to pay their taxes, pay their indebtedness, and in a great many instances, indebtedness to the Government. Now with a three-fourths value insurance they can pay their taxes, they can pay practically all of their indebtedness, and enter the new year on a good, sound basis.

I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the crop-insurance report program was begun as an experiment. The Committee on Agriculture held very extensive hearings before the legislation was passed. We went into the subject thoroughly, realizing we were touching upon a field that had never been explored. At the same time we realized that it was a field of very great importance as far as agriculture is concerned.

There is no industry in the world which needs insurance as much as agriculture, because the farmer is subjected to all the vicissitudes which affect other industries, and many more as well, yet it is the one great industry which up to now has not had the protection of insurance. I think all of us can realize the great value to agriculture of a crop-insurance system which should, upon trial, prove successful.

I am going to be perfectly frank and state that up to date I do not think we have had an opportunity to determine whether or not this system is going to be successful. I am willing to go further and say that I am somewhat disappointed in the results of the program so far; but we have to take into consideration also that it has been in operation on only one crop, and that during 2 out of the 3 years it has been in operation a large part of the area in which that crop was produced has suffered from very severe weather conditions. Those 2 years at least did not afford a fair trial of the efficacy and value of crop insurance.



Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Assuming that there was a loss on the insurance to the wheat farmers, was it not a good deal cheaper to pay the loss in that way than to put these people on relief, where they were before?

Mr. HOPE. I think so. Of course, I do not conceive of crop insurance as a relief measure. I do not feel it should be so considered. It ought to be a business proposition. Nevertheless, I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly in the view just expressed.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to what percentage of the wheat farmers take insurance or carry insurance under the existing plan?

Mr. HOPE. I cannot say just now what the percentage has been. I would say, offhand, about 20 percent.

Mr. HARE. Would the gentleman consider a suggestion that a plan may be worked out whereby the insurance policy could be incorporated or attached to or connected in some way with the soil-conservation policy and in that way have all of the growers participating in and contributing to the fund from which the losses should be paid?

Mr. HOPE. I have heard that suggestion made. I have not gone into it enough myself to have any opinion on it. Anything, however, which would result in wider participation would strengthen the system.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. A short time ago we had a bill here dealing with relief for the stricken farmers in many sections of the country, the cotton farmers and the dairy farmers. On the floor of this House that bill was defeated because many Members thought that they ought to have insurance. We have not tried out insurance on cotton, because we only passed it last year. It is unfair at this particular stage to take away all of the funds without giving it a test.

Mr. HOPE. I do not think there is any doubt about that. Of course, right now, as far as the winter-wheat producers are concerned, there have been many, many thousands of policies written, and those losses will have to be paid. The Federal Government is not going to repudiate those losses. I am sorry that I do not have more time to discuss this matter. May I conclude, however, by saying that I feel it would be a great mistake to adopt this amendment. Crop insurance is on trial. It will have to prove itself. I do not feel, however, that sufficient time has elapsed as yet to make a fair determination of the matter. Furthermore, if it is to be discontinued, this is no way to do it. It should only be done after adequate consideration by the proper legislative committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], this insurance program was considered an experiment from the very beginning. I was on the subcommittee and acted as chairman of the subcommittee that first considered crop insurance. After the matter had been given very careful consideration by the subcommittee and by the full committee, a bill was reported and a program for wheat-crop insurance was approved, with the understanding at the time that as soon as sufficient data had been collected by the Department a program of insurance for cotton would be undertaken.

Subsequently my recollection is that a bill passed the House authorizing the program for cotton-crop insurance. My recollection is that the bill passed the Senate and the President vetoed the measure because he was of the opinion at that time that sufficient data had not been collected by the Department.

At a later date, however, the Congress passed another bill extending the benefit of all-risk insurance to the cotton farmers of the Nation. The President signed that bill and it is today the law of the land. Under that program the Department of Agriculture is just now making arrangements for the first time to make all-risk crop insurance available to the cotton farmers of the country.

The statement in the report of this subcommittee is very unfortunate, in my opinion. The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee should not have written into this report the language which appears here. No one understood at the beginning that this program could possibly be placed upon a sound basis from an actuarial standpoint within 2 or 3 years of operation. The suggestion has been made that this field of insurance had never heretofore been explored. The fact is the field has been explored but rather unsuccessfully by private corporations.

This was an experiment of great magnitude. It was one which we knew would involve the loss of a substantial sum of money. Nobody undertook to lead any Member of the House into believing that we could make a success of this great undertaking in just a year or two of operation. I do not know how the gentleman from Illinois voted on the original program and have not taken the time to check the record, but certainly this bill did not pass the House by unanimous consent. There was great controversy about it because many of the Members thought it was not feasible to undertake it at all. However, in an effort to give the farmers of the Nation an opportunity to insure their business, Congress undertook this very worth-while experiment.

Every other businessman in the country has the benefit of insurance. Even the showgirl can insure her dancing feet. But here is the farmer with his crop, in the field, exposed to every insect and

to all sorts of weather conditions. His livelihood is dependent upon it. To say that because we are going to lose a little money in trying to devise a sound insurance program for him we should abandon it right at its inception I do not think is right.

A ridiculous thing about this amendment, it appears to me, is that we are now just beginning the program. It seems to me we certainly should not abandon it now.

It is still in an experimental stage; and even if the Corporation is incurring losses, I am sure that the losses sustained to date do not greatly exceed the losses which were anticipated at the beginning of the program. I assume that every possible effort is being made to place the program on a self-sustaining and actuarially sound basis at the earliest possible date. The fact that so many hazards are involved and the situation is so different in different parts of the country, makes the program all the more difficult. I feel that the Department should be complimented upon the amount of data it has obtained and the calculations it has made. Even if the experiment is proving somewhat expensive, it may yet prove to be well worth the money which has been invested in it. The undertaking is too great for any private corporation, but it is not too great for the Federal Government to undertake if there is a probability of such a program being developed as will prove to be sound and lasting. We simply cannot afford to abandon it at the present time and I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I, like the preceding speaker, sat on the subcommittee that studied the farm crop insurance bill which finally passed the House. At that time I listened very attentively to every witness that came before the committee. One of the witnesses was a Mr. Green, who painted a very flowery picture and told us many things and prophesied many benefits to the farmers. I was convinced at that time, based on the testimony he presented to us, that this was going to be a good program for agriculture and for the farmer.

However, after the first year, relying on what Mr. Green told us, I asked for statistics from the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on administrative expense and the cost of the policies issued. I was amazed at the figures they gave me, and the cost of this program, which was far different than was painted to us in the first instance. They said:

You must let us experiment. We are right in the first year. The big part of the cost is the administrative expense and the cost of setting up the original administration of the bill. After we go through with that and have the administrative personnel set up, after we have gone through our year of experience, you will see a reduction in the rate next year and in the administration cost of this bill.

I am not opposed to the basic principle back of this proposition, but either it is unsound or it is being improperly administered.

Lo and behold! the next year it was more, and the third year it cost still more.

The thing that interests me is that with the little time the Subcommittee on Agriculture had to study the question that they saw the picture. I think this has gone far enough. Are we going to go into another field of experimentation? We have experimented in crop insurance on wheat. In my opinion it has been a complete failure, because of improper administration. If not improper administration then it is unworkable. Are we now going to spend millions and millions more to have another experiment in cotton, and then come back to the House and admit that we tried two experiments and that both of them failed?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the gentleman understand to begin with that this was an experiment?

Mr. HOOK. I understood it was an experiment, but I did not think it was the kind of experiment that we were going to continue year after year with a loss, and then go into another field when we had not decided whether or not the first one was successful.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman agree that it was understood that the cotton program would be undertaken as soon as the data were available in the Department?

Mr. HOOK. It was my understanding that the cotton program would be taken up provided the wheat-insurance program was a success. The gentleman will recall, if he will bear with me, that I raised that question at the time we brought up the question of cotton-crop insurance.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman expect the crop-insurance program to be able to demonstrate its sufficiency within 1, or 2, or 3 years?

Mr. HOOK. I expected it at least to demonstrate its sufficiency within the second year. It might not have been put on a paying basis the first year, but it certainly should have demonstrated that it was going to be sound and able to be operated to the success of the farm program during that time.

Mr. COOLEY. Did not the advocates of the program definitely state to the subcommittee and the full committee that it would be impossible to put it on a sound basis in 2 or 3 years?

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman will recall that we were told that within 2 years they would be on an operating basis under which the premiums would not cost the Government anything; that the farmer himself would take care of it. It has not proved out that way. In fact, this program puts submarginal land into production when we are trying to get submarginal land out of production. This is the way it works: These large owners of submarginal land go to the banker and loan money to plant this poor grade of land, knowing there will be a failure.

The banker knows the crop is insured. He is protected on his loan. These submarginal-land sharks clean up on the insurance, and the Government and the real farmer hold the bag. Let us stop it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this or any amendment which would abolish crop insurance, for I have always been an enthusiastic advocate of every kind of insurance—life insurance, fire insurance, property insurance, and feasible insurance of any and every kind. Insurance is an important economic concept which is tremendously valuable socially as well as economically when the institution is properly conducted.

I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that this program, which has now been 3 years in operation with regard to wheat, has proven successful the third year, and has been profitable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be willing to be corrected at that point?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The losses in 1941 were twice as much as the losses in 1939, exclusive of the administration cost, which was well over \$5,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Probably I should have said it was successful the third year with wheat in a large majority of the States. However, I want to set forth that this was an experiment, and we cannot rule a thing out like this merely because it is not quite perfect in the experimental stage. Would you military men say that because we have had bad luck with certain military experiments we should never try to perfect, for instance, lighter-than-air warfare? Such a stand is hardly feasible, hardly good sense.

I want to say this: We are instructed to bear one another's burdens. That is what good society attempts to enable its members to do. That is what the social institution, the economic institution, of insurance will do. The farmer is one man who is subjected to more risks than any other businessman or any other citizen. Yet we would want him to take all the risks, even the avoidable risks, if we destroy this institution now before it has had time to be thoroughly tried, tested, and perfected on a mathematical basis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not time to yield at this point.

I want to say to you gentlemen that every private insurance company in America has done a certain amount of experimenting. Old life insurance is in America, some life-insurance companies have gone broke. Fortunately, most life-insurance companies have succeeded, which may be due in part to good management and in part because they made a lucky guess in regard to premiums and mortality tables in the very beginning of their existence. Now, after many years, it is no guesswork, for they have absolutely reliable data. We have got to get statistical data on this propo-

sition of crops worked out to a point where premiums will counterbalance or more than counterbalance probable losses. We have not had time to do that with regard to wheat, and certainly not with regard to cotton.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the program requires 5 or 6 years to demonstrate its soundness, does not the gentleman think it will be well worth while and a good investment on the part of the Government?

Mr. MURDOCK. I certainly do, and for that reason I am opposed to the pending amendment, not only because this is interfering with a policy and is in effect legislating through an appropriation bill, but I am opposed to taking snap judgment such as this amendment would do at this point of the experimental effort.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you must have insurance on fire, life, property, marine insurance, and all that sort of thing. The Government is willing to do much of that in time of war. Just a few days ago we voted a system of insurance to bear the risk of war of our own citizens with regard to property losses. How long will it take us to realize that the American farmer is embattled all the time, as well as after war is declared, and that we ought to take this step to enable him to share his burden with his neighbors and thus not be overpowered by these accumulative hazards upon the individual farmer.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HARRINGTON. When this program was originally conceived, does the gentleman think the idea was for the Government to make money at the expense of the farmer out of the insurance program?

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not understand this is a money-making proposition on the part of the Government any more than carrying the mail was to be a money-making proposition at its inception. We must expect to suffer some losses in carrying the mail, but it is for the general good, and this is also for the general good.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it the gentleman's idea that enough money should be collected in premiums to pay the losses?

Mr. MURDOCK. It certainly is, and that, I think, is the intent of the program. Just as soon as it can be put on a solid actuarial basis, there will be collected premiums sufficient to pay the losses.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I may be all wrong, but it had seemed to me that the farmers of this Nation were entitled to a little security. You know they are the foundation of everything—what they produce out there in the fields.



They are merely asking today for the privilege of perfecting a system whereby, together, they may protect themselves against unusual losses. There are about 3,000,000 farmers involved in this \$8,000,000 appropriation. Do you know what the chairman up here told me a minute ago? You are this year appropriating \$100,000,000 as the Government's contribution to the security of the civil-service employees of the United States Government—\$100,000,000 to further protect about 1,000,000 Government employees who, from their youth to their old age, will be making a minimum of at least \$120 a month, while the wheat and the cotton growers out yonder, furnishing you with the food and fiber to live and be clothed with, are on a wage of from \$20 to \$30 or \$40 a month. It is all right to protect everybody but the farmer. The railroads—when their wages go up they go to the Interstate Commerce Commission, as they did a few days ago, and get a rate increase of \$200,000,000, the major part of which the farmers of this Nation will have to bear. It is all right to give \$100,000,000 to supplement the retirement of 1,000,000 civil-service employees, but, no, you must not spend \$8,000,000 to put some security into the hands of the millions of people who produce the food and the clothing for this Nation. That must not be done—that is an experiment.

Yes, it is an experiment, and if you will give us an opportunity, it will be one of the greatest experiments this Nation has ever undertaken. I appeal to you today, and I talk to you as sensibly as I know how. Let us give to the farmers of this Nation some security, so when they put the seed in the ground they will have some conception of what the harvest is going to be. How many of you have ever farmed? Have you ever stood in your wheat field in May and seen the prospect of a fine crop, and then later watch the clouds go away and stand there and see your wheat practically burned in the field? Have you ever stood in a cotton field the first of June and seen one of the most beautiful prospects that a kindly God can bestow and then watch the rains come and look at those bolls and find where the weevil has punctured every boll in the field, and instead of 250 or 350 pounds of cotton to the acre you may get a bale out of 10 acres? You do not know what you are seeking to do here. You damn the only man who has never raised his voice for double pay or time and a half for overtime. All he is saying here is, "Give me a chance to do my part to win the war, but, for God's sake, let me have the opportunity in the security program of this Government, to know when I plant seed what the harvest will be."

Mr. LEAVY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The function of the Committee on Appropriations, as I understand it, is to see how much

money is necessary to carry out the provisions of the various acts of the Congress.

Mr. LEAVY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The merits or demerits of any law passed by the Congress should not have anything to do with this, because the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would say "We do not expect to carry out the will of Congress, and, therefore, this agency must be obliterated."

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and, so far as the committee report is concerned, that report was made by a divided subcommittee. I appreciate that no one has contended otherwise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the major object and result of this is to keep certain marginal land under cultivation, and thus prevent any curtailment of crops?

Mr. LEAVY. I think just the opposite, because the premium rates are fixed upon what the production of any particular region has been, breaking it down by counties for a period of 20 years in the western country, and for 10 or 15 years in other sections of the country. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what this is. In the first place, I am in full accord with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brown] that the Committee on Appropriations—and I have been a member of that committee ever since I have been in the House—has no right to starve an activity that the Congress as a whole has said should exist. Congress enacted a law providing for crop insurance. Crop insurance has not been the great loss that it has been pictured. Thus far it has dealt with a crop that is a billion dollar a year crop. When it passed the original act Congress provided a capital structure of \$100,000,000 for crop insurance, and the actual losses after 3 years have not been the figure that I have heard repeated here a number of times.

Instead of that, the losses or impairment of capital are \$9,328,563, and if crop insurance had been put into effect in 1937 instead of 1939, because we had 2 years of normal yield, in 1937 and 1938, it would actually have shown a margin of profit. If you will read the hearings, you will find that 36 States in this Union had policyholders in this insurance, and last year, bad as it was, 31 States, where crop insurance was in operation, showed a margin of profit in the premiums collected as against indemnities paid. The loss occurred in only 5 States, and the average yield of wheat for the Nation indicated that 1939, 1940, and 1941 were bad years in some very important sections. What is the attitude of the farmers about this crop insurance? I wish that my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has offered this amendment, would get these figures. In Illinois, in 1939, 12,000 farmers took insurance. In 1940, 26,000, and in 1941, 35,000. In Kansas in '39, 14,000; in 1940, 58,000; and in 1941, 60,900; and

in Nebraska, 13,000 the first year, 53,000 the next year, and 63,000 last year. I could go on down through these figures. Now, as a matter of good conscience, and I think as a matter of law, we do not have any right to destroy this program by denying appropriations when just recently, by legislative enactment, we said to the American wheat and cotton farmer, "You can now take a 3-year insurance policy instead of a policy for 1 year, and you can give a note against your soil-benefit payments, instead of giving wheat or cotton, and thus save the Government warehousing, and can insure yourself for a 3-year term in the matter of your crop, which means your living."

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 61 and noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$2,500,264.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman will not be satisfied if the entire provision relating to the Farm Tenant Act may be read and open to amendment at the same time—the loan provision as well as the administrative expense?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no particular objection. I know the gentleman will be liberal in the matter of debate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the language with reference to farm tenancy be read and that the entire language be open for amendment and discussion at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the request of the gentleman refers simply to pages 80 and 81?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. And not to page 82?

Mr. TARVER. No, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Loans: For loans in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act,

approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$45,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum, and which sum shall not be used for making loans under the terms of said act for the purchase of farms of greater value than the average farm unit of 30 acres and more in the county, parish, or locality in which such purchase may be made, which value shall be determined solely according to statistics of the farm census of 1940; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary of Agriculture upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I offer the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 80, line 18, strike out "\$2,500,264" and insert "\$1,250,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that another amendment relating to this same paragraph be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of information?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 80, line 21, strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1942, which is the current fiscal year, we made provision for farm-tenant purchase loans in the sum of \$50,000,000, and also \$2,488,000 for administrative expenses. In 1943 it will be \$45,000,000, which is a reduction of \$5,000,000 from last year. The administrative expenses are, oddly enough, \$11,000 higher than they were last year.

I am offering two amendments. The first one is to virtually halve the administrative expenses and save \$1,250,000, and the second amendment would strike \$10,000,000 from the amount of loans which will be available.

Since 1938 we have made available for this farm-tenant purchase program \$75,000,000 in direct appropriation and \$100,000,000 in Reconstruction Finance

Corporation loans, making a total of \$175,000,000.

The last report we had from Mr. Baldwin, who is Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, is that 23,722 farms were purchased over most of the States of the Union. To me this is very singular. We make available an amount of money that will buy a farm, including livestock, including repairs to buildings, and such other buildings as are necessary, amortize it over a period of 40 years, and you would think that with liberal terms of that kind, a farmer, if he has got the stuff, would make good. Yet, lo and behold, the same Mr. Baldwin, who is Farm Security Administrator, comes before the committee and tells us that grants and operating rehabilitation loans have been made to the very people to whom Uncle Sam gave the money with which to buy a farm on the basis of 40 years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not just now. You will find it in the hearings. Ten thousand and fifty-nine loans were made to the same 23,000 people, or a portion thereof, who bought farms with Uncle Sam's money. Of that number 124 received outright grants.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, briefly.

Mr. TABER. How many were there who bought farms?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There were 23,722 to begin with. Rehabilitation loans and grants numbered more than 10,200 for the single fiscal year of 1941. That is nearly half of the people for whom we bought farms out of this fund.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman says the grants numbered 10,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. There were 124 grants. The rest of them were loans. I thought I made that clear. Ten thousand and fifty-nine loans and 124 grants.

Now, that would not be so bad if they were not out buying land on a rising land value market. You need not take my word for it. Examine the table that the Secretary of Agriculture himself inserted in volume 2, page 66, of the hearings. There you will find that in the very areas where farm-tenant purchase loans are heaviest because of a preponderance of farm tenancy, land values have gone up 6 points since 1939. I do not know that we ought to go along with a program of that kind, and particularly so when the greater part of the county farm loan associations are delinquent at the present time. Back in 1916 when we set up this land purchase program through the land banks they operated through the county loan associations. Information gathered by your committee shows that whereas in 1932 there were 3,583 of these county loan associations in the United States, today 2,047 of them are so delinquent and their capital structure is so impaired that under the law they cannot make a single loan; and yet we go along with a farm-tenant purchase program where one-half of the people who purchased farms under it since 1938 come back for

operating loans and in some cases for grants.

I have opposed this program from the outset. I shudder to think what the ultimate-loss headache will be before we get through.

I hold in my hand a handbill that was circulated by the Farm Security Administrator at Center, Ala. Notice the title:

Attention, farmers, tenant sharecroppers, farm laborers! Make application now for the purchasing of farms from the farm tenant purchase program or Farm Security Administration. There is no limit to the number of farms that can be bought in Cherokee County this year. This may be your opportunity to become a farm owner. If you know a friend who might be interested, do not fail to tell him. It might be his only chance.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In just a moment.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to ask the gentleman a question about the circular he referred to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to finish this and then make an observation.

It might be said, of course, that the director down there published that at his own expense—at least, that is what the hearings show; and it might be said that this is one of those isolated things and that therefore you can draw no conclusion from it; but in this connection I call attention to a letter which one of the directors of the Farm Security Administration in Washington directed to the district director of Farm Security in Alabama to the effect that they have got the money, they have got the personnel, that they have been assigned a quota and they have got to go out and place the loans. It did not say anything about need, it did not say anything about whether there were farms available or whether those people were in need down there, but they were to go out and get them. So much in respect of the rural rehabilitation loans, and can we conclude that way down deep and fundamentally they are operating in any other fashion with respect to the farm tenant purchase program?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was talking about the rural-rehabilitation loan, not the farm-purchase loan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am talking about both.

Mr. COOLEY. But the gentleman's amendment deals with the farm-tenancy section and not with the rural-rehabilitation loan section.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. This is the farm-purchase program I am referring to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows, of course, that the Farm Security Administrator disapproved strongly of this advertising gotten out by the supervisor at Center, Ala.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. It had been gotten out at the supervisor's personal expense and without any authority from the Administration.



Mr. DIRKSEN. That is the reason I referred to the letter from this man in Washington, wherein he wrote to the Farm Security director at Center telling him that they had the money; that they had the personnel; that he should go out and place the loans.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman have reference to the letter referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] yesterday, written by Mr. J. C. Lewis on March 1, 1941?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. I hold in my hand a copy of a letter addressed by Mr. Baldwin to the gentleman from Virginia, in which he points out that the letter in question was not correctly quoted. I hold in my hand a correct copy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was referring to the letter sent to the district's director.

Mr. TARVER. I am talking about the letter of the district supervisor. It has not been correctly quoted. I hold in my hand the correct version.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be singular, indeed, if a subordinate in the Farm Security Administration, who is one of the district directors, has incorrectly quoted one of the managers in the Washington branch.

Sixty-five percent of all this money is being expended in eight or nine States. I suppose that is in conformity with the law because the law provides it has to be done proportionately on the basis that tenancy bears to the whole farm population of that particular State; so I assume it is worked out according to that basis. But the amazing thing is that the loans and the grants that were made in 1941, after we bought farms for folks, runs the highest in those particular areas. In Alabama 77 percent of the farm-tenant purchasers also got these loans. That was in 1941. There were 62 percent in Georgia, 57 percent in Mississippi, 47 percent in North Carolina, and 58 percent in South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, there is no substance to a program like that. My quarrel with it is that we are going to have the same experience that we had with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. We are going to run deeply in the red and if there was an excuse for it then, there is no excuse for it now with things on a rising curve at the present time and the country at war. There is a solemn responsibility upon the Congress to curtail these activities and these abuses, and it seems to me there have been abuses. This is just one of them.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if this phase of the work that is being done by the Farm Security Administration shows that it is in the red now or, if, on the other hand, it shows they are actually in advance of current payments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will tell the gentleman what I can do. I will take a program like this, and I do not care what they pay back. If you will give me enough money every year to make loans, to keep existing loans current, I will

never be in the red. I can always keep going.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Tarver]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will examine the hearings, they will find that no member of our subcommittee was more critical of the Farm Security Administration and its operations than I have been. You will find literally hundreds of pages of evidence developed by the subcommittee with regard to practices on the part of the Farm Security Administration which we thought were not good practices, and in the preparation of the bill which you now have before you and in the succeeding paragraphs of the bill you will find restrictions proposed by the subcommittee with a view to correcting these practices which we thought were bad. So I do not come before you to undertake to defend all of what has been done by the Farm Security Administration. I do think that in many instances it has been incorrectly charged with misfeasance upon the basis of rumors and upon the basis of incorrect information. I do not think you ought to charge the Farm Security Administration in Washington with the act of a farm supervisor down at Center, Ala., who had an advertisement printed at his own expense which contained statements that were not correct; nor should you consider abolishing any part of the work of that Administration on account of the misfeasance of a farm supervisor in the field. I have quite a lot of these farm-tenant borrowers in my district.

We have millions of tenants in the United States. Approximately 60 percent of the farm population in my congressional district are tenants, and I am for any proposal which is reasonable in character that will aid those tenants to become landowners. I think it ought to be one of our national objectives to have those who till the soil become the owners of the soil, not collectively, as has been attempted by the Farm Security Administration in some instances, but as individuals. We have undertaken to stop these collective operations by a provision contained in the following portions of the bill.

I would like to do something for these millions of men who do not own land which they till. I have gone out in my district and visited the homes of a great many of those who are farm-tenant land purchasers. I have investigated the circumstances in each particular case of their purchases, the amount of their repayment, and the progress they have made. With one or two exceptions out of the number of homes I visited, I found that these tenant operators were repaying their loans and, in most instances, were paying ahead of the amounts of their maturities. They were not, therefore, receiving anything from the Government which they were not accounting

for. I found in those homes families of people who seemed to have a new hope in life, people with children who were filled with greater ambition. In the cases of those farm-tenant families the Government has certainly lost nothing, and while they are not as numerous as I wish they were—I wish the Government could have reached more people than it has been able to reach—I can conceive of no reason why the Government should undertake to abandon any attempt to help that type of people.

Taking the country as a whole, they are repaying their loans at the rate of 99 percent of the maturities and when repayments of amounts not due are taken into consideration, 120 percent of the amounts of maturity. When you compare with that record and I call your attention to page 190 of the hearings to show that this statement is correct, the record of the business borrowers from the R. F. C., you will find that those borrowers are to the extent of 7.87 percent delinquent in their matured obligations. The American tenant farmer who has been accorded benefits under this program is delinquent only to the extent of 1 percent. He has been able to make a better record than that which has been made by the business interests of this country that have been served by loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Just why under those facts should the House consider cutting out the money which has been used in this very useful program?

The gentleman may say that he has not proposed in his amendment to cut it out, he has proposed to reduce it. That is true. He proposes to reduce administrative expenses by one-half and to reduce the amount of loans by \$10,000,000 from \$45,000,000. Remember that in administrative expenses the Farm Security Administration not only has to look after the new loans that have to be made but it has to look after all the loans that have been made heretofore, aggregating, as I recall it, substantially \$185,000,000. The interests of the Government must be taken care of. The farm supervisors in the field must keep in touch with these tenant-borrowers, aid them in their farming program, and collect from them the amounts which are due the Government. Therefore, you could not cut the appropriation by \$10,000,000 on the loan authorization and at the same time fairly cut the administrative expenses half in two. In my judgment, you ought not to do either one.

One of the most frequent criticisms of this program has been that it serves so few people. Only 23,000 farmers, approximately, have been enabled to buy homes. Only 9,000, approximately, will be able to secure loans to buy homes during the present fiscal year. It has helped so few people, they say, and there are so many who ought to be helped, that we simply ought to abandon the program altogether.

I do not find in my district, where we have so many tenant farmers, that the tenant farmer who does not get a loan is bitter against the man who does succeed in getting a loan. On the contrary,

if he has filed his application—I believe there have been about 18 applications filed for each loan it has been possible to grant—and some other tenant—his neighbor, perhaps—gets a loan and his application is declined, he devotes himself to trying to build up such a record in farming and in the management of his farm operations as will cause the county committee to act favorably on his application next year. It is, therefore, not only the small number of people you are able to grant loans to but the tremendously larger number who are inspired by the operations of this program to improve their farming operations and to establish better records for industry and for business management of their farms that you indirectly aid.

The amount which is carried in this bill as a loan authorization is \$5,000,000 below the amount which has been made available the present fiscal year. It is certainly a program which is costing the Government nothing, a program which is vastly beneficial to the individuals who are directly concerned. It seems to me there certainly should not be any hesitation on the part of the House in approving the comparatively small amount which is proposed to be authorized in the committee bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my position with reference to this matter of farm tenancy is too well known, especially by the members of the subcommittee, for me to have to spend much time talking about it. I am against the theory, the concept which underlies and is involved in the whole process. I am against the paternalistic theory of government on which the program rests. I am also opposed at this time to loaning 1 cent of the money of the taxpayers to anybody any further than may absolutely be necessary to continue a skeletonized organization with respect to those who have already undertaken to take advantage of this program. No man dares suggest that sectionalism enters into my consideration of this matter. This is my country. I am opposed to the theory of farm tenancy. I mean tenancy.

Do you know it will take 280 years, under the law as it now stands, to complete this program at \$50,000,000 a year, to say nothing about the loans, which is \$14,000,000,000, and more, of the taxpayers' money going into these experimental economic propositions and into a socialistic and theoretical program, in which certainly at this time we cannot afford to indulge at the expense not only of the taxpayer, but at the peril of the loss of our liberty?

We cannot afford to go back to the feudal system, with the Government the landlord. You just cannot avoid nor evade that; for the Government, the bureaucrats are the Santa Claus; and they and those of you who are so anxious to continue this program full force will have to explain to your own constituents why you propose to expend fifteen billions of the taxpayers' money at a time and during a period when we need every

cent for the conduct of the war. You do not seem to realize that the days of the spending orgy are over.

You—and that means all of us—we cannot carry on our social, humanitarian experiments as such at the expense of the taxpayer on top of all other necessary expenditures. Tenant farmers? I ask you where is farm labor to be found today? Spend your time worrying about making it possible for farmers of today to carry on. The absentee owner of the farm-tenant farm is another problem. It is time to cut this proposal to the skeleton, for the duration—north, east, south, and west.

When you get right down to the theory back of all this program it is all un-American, and it is all wrong—or else we have gotten so far away from fundamentals that we cannot see them.

"Poor farmer group." That is an insult. Poor doctor, poor lawyer, poor dentist, poor industrialist—why not—as well? Paternalism undiluted and unadulterated can be dispensed with for the duration, and will have to be before we are through with this war, or we will be through forever.

I am in favor of the amendments.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago, in 1937, when the legislative committee of the House reported this legislation for the Bankhead-Jones farm-tenant purchase program, it was supposed to be in the nature of an experiment, and the legislative committee authorized the sum of only \$10,000,000 for the first year to start the program and then \$25,000,000 for the next year, with a provision for \$50,000,000 annually thereafter. The third year we changed the method from making appropriations for the farm-tenant purchase plan to that of borrowing money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on loans, so they were authorized last year to borrow \$50,000,000 for the making of loans under this program. This year they have cut that \$50,000,000 authorization to \$45,000,000.

The committee has gone very fully into the subject of the success or failure of the farm-tenant purchase program, and I tell you as one member of that committee that as far as I know there has been no better program adopted by this Government.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal of criticism of the Farm Security Administration, some of which has been deserved and some not. The committee has gone as fully as possible into that subject. We have listened carefully to witnesses on both sides. We have the greatest admiration and respect for those witnesses who have come before us with concrete suggestions as to economies, but the committee felt that to materially cut down or to destroy the farm tenant purchase program which, I think, has been one of the most successful parts of F. S. A., by not giving them sufficient funds to operate, and to cut out the authority to make these loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, would be a mistake.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if the criticism which has been directed at the Farm Security Administration has not been directed more at the loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation provisions?

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, I do not recall having heard anything except praise for the part of the program which is now under consideration.

Mr. TERRY. That is the reason I am surprised that the effort is now being made to cut down this part of the program. As was said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the repayment of loans under this program has been 99 percent, on the average, over the United States. On page 216 of the hearings you will see that, as regards tenant purchase loans, the average percentage of collections to maturities, as of December 31, 1941, was 99 percent.

The State of Illinois has repaid 97.4 percent. The State of Arkansas, my own native State, I am proud to say, has a record of 99.1 percent. As a matter of fact, these loans have been overpaid, and I just want to make this statement: The Government has been lending money over the United States for the past 10 years, and until this program was adopted there was no place where the small tenant farmer could go for help or relief, and I may say it seems to me that the farmers of the country, the small farmers of the country, the people from whom you would expect the least in the way of payments, have done the most, and they are making a record of which we may all be proud.

I oppose the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and on all amendments to the sections relating to the Farm Tenancy Act close at 4 o'clock.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment at the desk which has not yet been reported.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure the Chairman would try to take care of gentlemen having amendments.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that would mean about a minute and a half apiece.

Mr. TARVER. I will modify the request and ask unanimous consent that debate close at 4:15 on the paragraphs and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman make it 1 hour?

Mr. TARVER. That is only a matter of 8 minutes and I will concur in the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is not clear to me what paragraphs are involved.

Mr. TARVER. Both of the paragraphs relating to farm tenancy.



Mr. MCINTYRE. Would that include the paragraphs on page 82?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not affect page 82.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have at least 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that there are nearly 20 Members standing who indicate a desire to speak and 1 hour will give them between 2 and 3 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. May I suggest to the gentleman that we have been trying for 10 days to pass the bill and the only possible way to complete its consideration today is to have some limitation on the time for debate. I hope no one will object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the motion or request directed to all amendments to the farm-tenancy paragraphs.

Mr. TARVER. All amendments to the paragraphs ending at the bottom of page 81.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not want to be foreclosed to say a word or two on the other amendment at the desk, because that amendment would now be pending.

Mr. TARVER. That, of course, would be a matter for the determination of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have been interested in this program from its beginning, and if the gentleman means that I am to have only 2 minutes to discuss this matter—

The CHAIRMAN. That question has already been settled. There was no objection to the request and the time is now limited to 1 hour.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, most of the debate on this farm-tenancy program has sounded as if there had never been a Pearl Harbor. It seems to me there is a fundamental difference between this kind of appropriation and many of the others in the agriculture bill. What harm could possibly come to the country if this entire program of buying farms were postponed for 5 years?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman will understand I am limited in my time and cannot yield until I have explained an amendment I expect to offer.

The rural-rehabilitation loans are another matter. I regard them as an important part of an operating program in producing food for victory, but so far as this land-buying program is concerned, I have yet to hear a single reason to show there would be anything

serious happen to this country if the entire land-buying program were postponed for 5 years.

We got along for a hundred years without it and while it may have its good points, the life of the Nation does not depend on it. If we maintain it at peacetime levels, we will also be called on for more funds to carry it along administratively. No possible harm can come to the country if we cut it down for a few years. If we cut it out entirely, we would be no worse off than we were before the program was started a few years ago. I am only proposing to reduce it, however.

Farm tenancy is a problem, but it is not a life-and-death matter in time of war. I think the amendment that has been offered to cut off ten million is not enough of a saving. So I have an amendment at the desk which would reduce the \$45,000,000 carried in the bill to \$25,000,000, which would halve the actual appropriation of the current year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Briefly. Mr. DIRKSEN. Merely to observe that the largest farm organization, the American Farm Bureau Federation, is in favor of a substantial cut in this item.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If this item were cut to \$25,000,000, \$20,000,000 below the recommendation in the bill, it would be the equivalent of saving \$20,000,000 that must be raised in taxes. It would be equivalent to saving \$20,000,000 that has to be raised in Defense bonds and stamps. As a friend of every farm program, that appeals to me to be sound for actual farmers. I want to say that there is no program in my part of the country that is causing so much criticism today as this use of money to buy land, taking money from school children who sell old newspapers to buy Defense stamps, taking money from school teachers, taking money from laborers, taking money from farmers who pay taxes by hard work, to turn around and buy land at this time, while the country itself is in danger.

I see no justification in trying to carry on this program on a peacetime basis. I am in favor of the rehabilitation loans, because those are operating loans, necessary to carry on production. But there is a fundamental difference between that F. S. A. program and this plan of dispossessing one farmer, and putting another on the farm, through money from the Treasury of the United States. This program of land readjustment can wait; the land will produce as well for a renter as for an owner. Certainly no harm is done if the program slows up until we have licked the Axis.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman understand that this is not a land purchase program? This only provides for loans, to help the tenant.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is to help the tenant buy farms under title I of the Farm Tenant Act. The language of title I of the act specifically provides for loans for the purchase of land and sets up the procedure for doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that I have been just about as critical as any other Member of the House of some of the activities of the Farm Security Administration. I have tried to constructively criticize this agency. I have sought to be helpful to the officials charged with administering the laws which we have enacted and which the officials of the Farm Security Administration have in many instances violated, both in letter and in spirit, but I am just as anxious to save and to continue this particular part of the program now under consideration as I am to force that agency to liquidate certain other parts of programs upon which the agency has embarked. The program now under consideration is one which Congress itself created. This program is known as the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act, under which the title to not one single acre of land is acquired or is authorized to be acquired. The basic legislation provides only for loans to worthy tenants on a long-term basis and at a low rate of interest. The purpose of the law which we enacted was to assist worthy tenant farmers to become home owners. No loan can be granted to a tenant for the purpose of enabling him to purchase a farm until both the tenant and the land to be purchased are approved by a local committee of farmers. This local committee passes upon the health, the habits, and the character of the tenant who is applying for a loan, and they likewise pass upon the value of the property about to be purchased, and this local committee must approve the applicant and must approve the farm as a self-sustaining farming unit, upon which the tenant, the person to whom the loan is to be made, will be able to earn a livelihood for himself and his family and to meet his payments to the Farmers Home Corporation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman think this is an activity which could well be suspended during the duration of the emergency?

Mr. COOLEY. I would not say that the agency is indispensable. While it may well be suspended during the emergency, I see no necessity for depriving the farmers of the privilege of borrowing money on a long-term basis and at a low rate of interest from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through this agency in the Department of Agriculture, especially while other citizens are continuing to obtain Government loans, or loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The loans were authorized to encourage home ownership in the rural sections of America.

Mr. COX. I have a genuine appreciation of the efforts of the gentleman to clean up this dirty mess within the Farm Security Administration, but frankly I am somewhat disappointed that he should come to the rescue of the Administration insofar as this item is concerned.

Mr. COOLEY. I am coming to the rescue of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant

Purchase Act, which our committee very carefully considered and drafted and presented to this House under the leadership of Marvin Jones, who was at the time chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. No man was ever a member of this body who was more intensely interested in the welfare and happiness of the tenant farmers of America than was Marvin Jones. I do not believe that many men appreciated more than he the vicissitudes and hardships which are experienced by the tenant farmers of the Nation. If my recollection is correct, Marvin Jones was reared as the son of a tenant farmer, and during his entire career in the House of Representatives he had a burning desire to do something constructive which would alleviate the suffering and the hardships of those who were forced to work on the farms of others and to provide hope and help for worthy tenant farmers who wanted to own their own farm home. You no doubt will recall the great interest of our late and beloved Speaker, Hon. William B. Bankhead, in the Tenant Purchase Act, which became a law during the time that he was Speaker of this House. His distinguished brother, Senator JOHN BANKHEAD, piloted the bill through the Senate, and as coauthor, along with the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas, Marvin Jones, this bill now bears his name.

I am intensely interested in the complete success and in the expansion of the program which is provided by the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act, and I would gladly vote to double the amount which is authorized in this bill for loans to tenant farmers to enable them to become home owners, but I bitterly oppose the efforts of officials of the Farm Security Administration to evade this law and the other laws which we have enacted in behalf of tenant farmers and to prostitute the program and the purpose for which we have made money available. These officials have circumvented the law and have devised ways and means to defeat the clear intent and purpose of Congress. All of the charges which I have preferred against the officials of the Farm Security Administration have been substantiated by the Comptroller General in the opinion he recently rendered upon evidence contained in this record, which was submitted to him by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill. Some months ago I introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a special committee to be appointed from the membership of the House Committee on Agriculture, to fully and completely investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration and to obtain full information regarding the many programs upon which this agency has embarked, in violation of law. The members of the House Committee on Agriculture are friends of the Farm Security Administration, and in seeking this investigation we seek only to obtain full information which will be used as a guide in the drafting of legislation which will force a complete compliance with provi-

sions of law which Congress has enacted or which may hereafter be enacted. Certain projects should be immediately liquidated, but some orderly method of liquidation must be provided, and if it is to be provided the legislation should be written by the Committee on Agriculture only after it has obtained all of the facts. We hope that the Rules Committee will soon favorably report the resolution which is now pending, and that an appropriate and prompt investigation of this agency may be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. Chairman, the mail that is coming across my desk of late is growing in volume, and it begins to indicate a growing impatience on the part of the American people over three or four subjects of vital importance to all of us. One is the failure, or, at least, the indifference, of the Congress of the United States to curtail and reduce nondefense expenditures. Second, they are becoming impatient with our trying to conduct a war on social gains, such as the 40-hour week; and, third, they are becoming aroused over the necessity of paying time and a half and double time in order that men might work for their Government in producing essential materials of war. Donald M. Nelson sounded a note of warning a night or two ago on the radio when he said, "The people want production, and no fooling."

The public wrath is rising, and justly so. The people are justified in their attitude. Just a little while ago in this Chamber the committee refused to strike out an activity of this Government that has cost the people of this Nation in 3 years a loss of \$43,000,000. I refer to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. It was an opportunity to reduce nondefense spending and wasting of public money. I voted to strike it out.

Last week the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] made a determined effort on this floor to cut down some of the expenses in this bill. He met with consistent defeat in that effort. Members rise on this floor and say, "I am in favor of economy; I want to do everything that is necessary to carry on the war"; but they want to do it on the next bill—not the bill under consideration. That is evident this afternoon. My colleagues, in the name of a great nation at war, I appeal for a drastic reduction in the cost of government and nondefense spending.

Just a few days ago we increased the debt limit of this country to \$125,000,000,000. It is like setting a line of credit in a bank for somebody to reach up and begin spending until it is gone. How long will this continue? It will continue just as long as the credit of the Nation is good, but a day of reckoning is coming, and it is coming fast. Let every one of us remember there is a limit to the financial resources of this country. This trend of spending and wasting the public money must stop before complete economic

collapse comes to this Nation. We are at war. We are trying to conduct business as usual, but the times are not as usual. Our enemies are not conducting business as usual. They are working night and day, and if we are to meet them successfully in this war, we must adopt at once a program of complete and total effort to do so. Let us begin now and here by adopting the pending amendment to reduce expenditures.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Yes; we are at war, but in a time of war we need the resources of all, both large and small. This program was to help make landowners out of tenants. When a man becomes a landowner and he is no longer a tenant he feels more like getting in there and putting his shoulder to the wheel and producing. The man who actually owns his place, whether he has paid for it or not, does more toward the end of producing "food for freedom" than the man who is just a tenant. When a man owns his land he is less subject to be lured by communistic ideas than when he is a tenant.

I think this is a worthy program. I have not a single, solitary person in my district that participates in this program, but I fully realize that what we need in this program is food, and more food. The only place you are going to get an increase in food production for this war is from the small, family-size farmer, the type of farmer that you are making landowners out of by the Tenant Farmer Act and this appropriation—men who have been tenants before. That is where we will get our increased production. We are not going to get it from the large industrial farmer, because he has farmed to the limit before. We are not going to get it from the big plantation owner. But give this man who is provided for in this bill a chance and he will produce. This is the bill that was spoken for so eloquently by our late and beloved Speaker, Mr. Bankhead. He convinced me beyond a doubt that this program was actually needed in the section from which he came. Our beloved former colleague, Marvin Jones, who now graces the bench, was one of those who pleaded for this bill. The speakers who have spoken since then from that great section have convinced me.

I wish some of you men could have listened the other evening to Senator HILL of Alabama, when he told of the advantages that were in behalf of the farmers of his section by this piece of legislation. I know there would not be one vote against it if they heard that speech and the arguments he presented. In the interest of our war program, you should weigh well your vote here today. Produce food and win the war. A rifle in the hands of a starving man is not very effective. You cannot win the war with bullets alone. You may win votes but votes will not save you if the Japs are able to stop our boys because of lack of food.

[Here the gavel fell.]



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] is recognized.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the endeavors of the metropolitan press, the radio speakers, and many others to turn public opinion against appropriations for agriculture at the very time that the same agencies of publicity are demanding increased food and fiber production by the farmers, is evident as the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill comes up for consideration in this House. Statements about the increased income of agriculture as a whole are published to indicate that a live prosperity has succeeded the 20 or more years of depression and adversity which the farmers have endured. Along with such statements come price-fixing programs, threats of inflation if farm products increase in price, and all else that may arouse prejudice and protest influencing the amounts to be set aside to aid in permitting agriculture to function by ample production to feed the Nation and our allied nations while we are winning the war against Axis aggression.

The Farm Security Administration and its policy of aiding more farmers to produce more come in for criticism of the expense involved, without proper consideration of the results achieved, and the benefits shared in by the Nation as well as by those who are the farm clients of the program.

There are too many who seem to feel that increased production and higher price levels have solved the farm problem without taking into consideration facts indicating new troubles incident to the war, such as shortage of farm help, lack of facilities, lack of capital, and lack of the credit needed by millions of farmers who with true patriotism endeavor to respond to the demands being made upon them.

The bare statement that the aggregate of farm receipts was \$11,000,000,000 or more in 1941, an increase of approximately 10 percent over those of 1940, is meaningless if the further fact is omitted that at the same time \$1,000,000,000 were added to the farm income; the nonfarming population received an increase of \$27,000,000,000 of the national income. The farmers, composing 24 percent of the national population, received less than 4 percent of the total increase of national income.

About one-third the farmers more favorably situated annually receive about three-fourths the total farm income, leaving two-thirds of the farm population only one-fourth such income. Most farmers in the lower-income groups receive an actual income of less than \$1 per day.

The value of the farm-security program to thousands of farmers is shown by the excellent results in the Ninth District of Wisconsin, in which it has 2,093 farm clients. Some criticism has been voiced and now seems to be emphasizing the shortcomings in administration of the program in other States. Considering the vast program, dealing with hundreds of thousands of individuals, it is only natural that mistakes may

be made and some wrongs endured. Perfect administration of all Government policies has not yet been attained, but I can say that in my own State and in my own district, the F. S. A. program has been carried out with the minimum of criticism. The State administrators and those of the counties of the Ninth District, and the supervisory staffs, have been doing and are doing a wonderful work.

The 1940 census showed that the low-income half of the Nation's farmers produced only 12 percent of total values of farm products sold, traded, or used at home in 1939. With about 3,000,000 farmers scrambling to get approximately 1 out of every 10 farm-market dollars, it is no small wonder that they get little benefit from rising farm prices.

A recent report of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, chairman, throws further light on the troubles of the small farmer. The report states:

Today the family farm system, which has never prevailed in the cotton- and tobacco-producing areas of the South, and long ago lost its dominance in California, seems on the wane throughout the Nation. Large-scale operations, specialization of functions, mechanization, multiple, or chain farming are the predominant characteristics of our changing agriculture. \* \* \* Even in the regions where this system has not been established, the security and the prosperity of the independent farm operator, who, with his family and an occasional hired man, works his own land, is passing.

The Farm Security Administration is the agency authorized by Congress to give these small farmers the help they need. For several years a large portion of the low-income farmers in the Ninth District of Wisconsin, as well as in other rural areas of Wisconsin and the whole United States, have had to rely on the credit provided by the Farm Security Administration. If Farm Security were abolished or its activities curtailed, many of these farmers would lose the only opportunity they have to increase their production and improve their economic conditions. A report recently issued by the American Bankers Association shows that in many counties in Wisconsin farm-security loans form a large proportion of the non-real-estate agricultural loans made by all lending agencies. In the Ninth District the percentage ranges from 18.4 percent in Buffalo County to 44.3 percent in Eau Claire County, and in some other Wisconsin counties the percentage is even higher. This in itself demonstrates the need for this program, inasmuch as Farm Security Administration loans are made only to persons other credit agencies, such as banks and the production credit associations, are unable to assist.

These loans are being repaid. As of December 31, 1941, \$1,352,617 had been repaid on loans totaling \$2,994,806 in the Ninth District, even though a large portion of these loans will not fall due for 3 or 4 more years.

The Farm Security Administration also makes a limited number of loans to tenant farmers to enable them to purchase farms under the authority of the

Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. All of the tenant-purchase borrowers in the Ninth District, as well as in the whole State of Wisconsin, who have been on their farms long enough to have a loan payment fall due are 100 percent current in their repayments.

What is more, these small farmers have amply demonstrated their farming ability. Farm-security borrowers in the Ninth District, since they have been receiving help from the F. S. A., have increased their net income from \$595 to \$1,121. The value of the food they produce for home use has risen from \$120 to \$265.

With farm-security help, these families have also greatly improved the security of their position on the land. More than 4 out of every 10 farmers in the Ninth District do not own the land they farm. But with the aid of the Farm Security Administration, almost 9 out of every 10 tenant-farmer borrowers now operate their farms under written leases.

These families are now in a good position to help raise the food that is needed to win the war. But the families farm security is helping are only a part of the low-income group. In the whole United States there are about 500,000 small farmers receiving farm-security help at the present time, while there are at least 2,000,000 small farmers in the country who could take part in the food-for-freedom program if they were given a chance.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated that 35 percent of the increase in pork and lard, something like 40 percent of the increase in eggs needed, and similar portion of the other food increases called for by the war program could come from these low-income farmers.

There is every reason for continuing the farm-security program on a basis which will make it even more effective in increasing the food supply. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has warned the public that the prospects are not as favorable as they appeared to be a few months ago. Congress should not make the mistake of "too little and too late" as to the farm-production program.

The statistics as to the Farm Security Administration in the Ninth District in the State of Wisconsin present an interesting story of what is being done. They are as follows:

#### TENANT PURCHASE PROGRAM NINTH DISTRICT, WISCONSIN

Counties eligible: Barron, St. Croix, Pierce, Trempealeau, Dunn, Chippewa.

Number of loans approved (as of December 31, 1941): 111.

Amount of tenant purchase loans: \$658,548.  
Number of loans on which maturities have fallen due (as of June 30, 1941): 70.

Payments against maturities (as of June 30, 1941): \$9,842.

Delinquencies: None.

Payments versus maturities: 100 percent.

Extra payments: \$1,291.

Average amount of loan: \$5,933.

#### WISCONSIN AS A WHOLE

Number of loans approved (as of December 31, 1941): 279.

Amount of tenant purchase loans: \$2,066,229.

Number of loans on which maturities have fallen due (as of June 30, 1941): 170.  
 Payments against maturities (as of June 30, 1941): \$35,410.  
 Delinquencies: None.  
 Extra payments: \$8,956.  
 Payments versus maturities: 100 percent.  
 Average amount of loan: \$7,406.

#### FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FARM DEBT ADJUSTMENT

##### FOR NINTH WISCONSIN DISTRICT

Number of cases adjusted (June 30, 1941): 450.  
 Amount of debt adjusted: \$1,355,559.  
 Reduced: \$395,528.  
 In percent: 29.2.  
 Accounting for taxes amounting to \$10,983.

##### FOR WISCONSIN AS A WHOLE

Number of cases adjusted (June 30, 1941): 2,349.  
 Amount of debt adjusted: \$9,712,523.  
 Reduced: \$3,259,135.  
 Average reduction per case: \$1,387.  
 In percent: 33.6.  
 Accounting for taxes amounting to \$72,491.

#### Rural rehabilitation loans (as of Dec. 31, 1941)

Active standard borrowers	Amount, loan advances	Repayments	
		Prin- cipal	Interest
Ninth District, Wisconsin: 2,003.....	\$2,594,806	\$1,352,617	\$213,091
State: 8,488.....	12,232,777	5,708,396	861,686

#### Family progress, Farm Security Administration borrowers, 1941

	Before Farm Security Administration	1941
Ninth District, Wisconsin:		
Net income.....	\$895	1,121
Milk for home use..... gallons.....	223	312
Value of food for home use.....	120	255
Fruits and vegetables..... quarts.....	176	313
Meat for home use..... pounds.....	188	412
State of Wisconsin:		
Net income.....	579	1,111
Milk for home use..... gallons.....	223	312
Value of food for home use.....	130	291
Fruits and vegetables..... quarts.....	164	299
Meat for home use..... pounds.....	210	442

#### Tenure status of Wisconsin low-income farmers

	Percent full owners	Percent of tenants with written leases
Ninth District.....	27	89
State.....	30	87

Mr. Chairman, among the many communications I have received favoring continuance of the Farm Security program upon a liberal basis, I have selected several which are representative of the attitude of many prominent citizens of Wisconsin. They are those of K. W. Hones, president of the Wisconsin Farmers' Equity Union; Hon. G. Donald Barnes, mayor of Eau Claire; Hon. Earl W. Hanson, member of the Wisconsin Assembly; and A. R. Vogtsberger, vice president of the Bank of Menomonie. The telegrams and letters are as follows:

CHIPPEWA FALLS, Wis., March 3, 1942.

Farm Security Administration only ray of hope for unfortunate and low-income farm-

ers to reestablish themselves as farm owners. Wisconsin Farmers' Union urges you do everything to retain Farm Security Administration's appropriations and status quo of last year. Wisconsin Farm Security great assistance to farmers in general and our co-operation.

WISCONSIN FARMERS' EQUITY UNION,  
 K. W. HONES, President.

Eau Claire, Wis., February 24, 1942.

Do not eliminate or curtail the work of Farm Security. This program deals with people never before given any consideration. It makes our taxpayers not tax burdens. Expect Farm Security program to greatly assist some laborers in outskirts of city who are not working because of recent lay-offs at Gillette Tire Plant and Pressure Cooker. Sincerely ask your support of this program.

G. DONALD BARNES, Mayor.

ELK MOUND, Wis., February 27, 1942.

I understand that a bill providing for appropriations to carry on the work of the Farm Security Administration will come up for consideration in the near future.

I think I can say that much good has been done by our county office here to assist farmers who were in need and could get no financial help from other sources. Many of the farmers assisted are now paying up their loans and are in a better financial condition. In spite of the improved farm conditions, I am satisfied that there still will be some that will be in need of help to bring them out of the depths that they have been in. Some of them were in more difficult circumstances, and it will take them a little longer to be able to get on their own feet. In some cases outright grants will again be needed to carry them over.

It seems to me that this work should be continued for this year, or until such time it can be definitely shown that there is no further need of the service. I believe that it would be a mistake to cut off right now or make the appropriations too low in order to carry out the needed service. This county is providing free office space for both the county and district office.

E. W. HANSON,  
 Chairman, County Board,  
 Dunn County, Wis.

BANK OF MENOMONIE,

Menomonie, Wis., February 23, 1942.

It has been interesting to me to note the press releases pertaining to the law affecting the Farm Security Administration.

Naturally, I cannot speak for the Farm Security Administration activities in the South or any mismanagement which might have cropped up in other communities, but, from personal observation and contact in our own county and in counties adjoining this community, I cannot help but admire the fine and necessary work that has been done.

It is my opinion that the Farm Security Administration has done a worth-while and necessary work, and it should be continued because, most assuredly, the banks cannot lend their depositors' money to the full extent of the purchasing price of the personal property, and until such time that the equity is great enough in the personal property to borrow from a financial institution the Farm Security Administration can and does step in and carry them in the interim.

Perhaps there have been cases and there will be cases where the person borrowing does not live up to his obligations, but that does not condemn the majority who are trying to do their best and have succeeded. I am certain that the Farm Security Administration statistics will show that in paying off the obligations many of them are paid off faster than what they had originally been contracted for.

I believe the rehabilitation work that the Farm Security Administration has done, has

done more to bring back the self-respect of the average down-and-out farmer than any other agency now or at any other time set up by the Government.

Being a banker, naturally, I am interested in having governmental economy, but I do not think that not advancing money to people to become self-sufficient is economy because, if they do not become self-sustaining, they will become direct charges of the community and will be a greater tax burden than the method used by the Farm Security Administration. I do not think we should be penny-wise and pound-foolish, and it is my opinion that the Farm Security Administration should be continued, with the understanding that if the client of the Farm Security Administration can get borrowing from private associations he should do so.

Therefore, I think you should support any bill which will continue the Farm Security Administration, and I am certain that the majority of your constituents feel the same.

A. R. VOGTSBERGER,

Vice President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the burden of the argument today seems to me to be that we should forget and disregard the general welfare of the people on the home front. That was not the doctrine that animated Abraham Lincoln in the greatest days of the Republican Party. I call the attention of the Republican critics of this measure to the fact that on May 20, 1862, a Republican administration passed the homestead law, the purpose of which was to give 160 acres of land to the landless of that day. Here we were in the thick of a great civil war, and yet the Republican administration enacted the homestead law, which was one of the highest and most important achievements of the Republican Party. Was it socialism then? Was it paternalism then? Under this law between two and three million acres of land were settled during the period of the Civil War.

Now, gentlemen, we cannot give to the landless today free lands, because there are no more free lands in this country, but we can help the landless by lending to them money with which to buy farms and set themselves up in agriculture. Incidentally, the W. P. A., which we instituted at the beginning of the depression, was simply a modern version of the old Homestead Act. Instead of giving land we gave to the man a job.

Now, something has been said about the opposition of the Farm Bureau Federation. We, of course, accord to that organization attention and consideration, but the Farm Bureau is not united on this subject. The great Farm Bureau of the State of Ohio, through its secretary, Mr. Murray D. Lincoln, has wired me as follows:

Ohio Farm Bureau urges you to give full support to adequate appropriations for Farm Security Administration and Surplus Marketing Administration

MURRAY D. LINCOLN.

So there are divided counsels in that organization.

In conclusion, if you are going to wreck this program, remember you have \$700,000,000, or something approximating this amount, outstanding in loans that you have made to worthy farmers. Are you



going to nurse those loans and recover that money or are you going to let it be wasted? The conservative, wise procedure is to use every effort to reclaim that money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say upon this particular feature of the bill I intended to say upon the next section, and if I can get the time I am going to use 5 minutes on that section. Let me say here, however, that inasmuch as the gentleman from Illinois has brought into this particular question the attitude and the success or failure of the Security Administration and the general loans I want to refer to it now.

One would think from what has been said here that there are no tenants anywhere except in the South. One good friend of mine said:

Keep still, this does not affect you any, this is a bill that is going to help the South.

Well, for God's sake! I thought you were through with the North and South a long time ago. If there is any body of farmers in distress in the South, it distresses the Nation, and I will never take a position in this Congress just because there is a geographical difference, that I am going to cast my vote in favor of the district in which I live, at the expense of any other section of the country.

Last year there were 575,000 farmers foreclosed in the United States of America—575,000. Do you suppose none of them were foreclosed in North Dakota? They become tenants, and when they become tenants we try to get some land for them, that is all. It applies to the South, it applies to the North.

I have repeatedly stated that when this Congress takes a notion to save money it invariably starts to deny the farmers a square deal. The Republicans in particular rise up in a solid body to fight farm legislation. On some of these votes today only three Republicans have stood up for the farmers. There is no economy in this attitude. If the farmers are put off the farms and into the relief lines, the Government will have to maintain them at the rate of about \$700 annually. Is it objectionable to let them go to work to support themselves? Great stress has been put on the loss the Government will sustain in these loans, but the hearings disclose that all payments to date have been paid 99 percent and that payments not yet due have been paid by many. When a plan will pay its own way, where is the economy in destroying it and forcing literally thousands of farmers back in the bread line?

When a farm bill comes up, a great mass of Members lose their reason and start a stampede no more intelligent than I have seen on the cattle range.

That is all I desire to say upon this feature of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the opposition to this

farm-tenant purchase program. All of you, of course, heard the statement made that at the present rate it would take 286 years to clear up the situation. I doubt if the tenancy situation will ever be completely cleared up, but even if it does take 286 years, that is no reason why we should delay starting this program.

Farm tenancy when disproportionately high is a dangerous thing. When in any section of the country there is a growing tendency toward a high percentage of farm tenancy it is time for the people to wake up. I am glad to notice that in my own State the rate of farm tenancy in the last 5 years has dropped from approximately 65 percent to 58 percent. I do not attribute it wholly to the activities of the Farm Security Administration and the farm-tenant purchase program, but I do know that has had a good deal to do with it. I have seen that program work, I have seen it in the counties of my district and I know something about the efficiency with which it is done, particularly the way in which it is received by our people. I cannot understand the criticism of this program from a financial standpoint when throughout the United States there has been a collection of 99 percent of the maturities.

In my own State, I notice, it has been 99.3 percent. No other program in the United States, I dare say, can show a better record than that. It is strange to me that this program, getting its money from the R. F. C., can be criticized with that kind of showing when, as a matter of fact, day after day we stand here, and we praise the R. F. C. for the work that it does with business. We have no hesitancy in authorizing the R. F. C. to go out and help these businessmen expand their factories and build new factories, and to do various things; yet I dare say that agency has never made any such collection record as this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a matter of fact, is it not true that Jesse Jones does not lend money unless he expects to get every dollar of it back?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is true. We were told in this debate that loans made by Farm Security were to be regarded, as the gentleman from North Dakota said, as being that much money taken away from our defense program, that much money that might be saved to our taxpayers.

He speaks as if they were gifts. They are not gifts. They are loans; loans that have been paid back to date at the rate of 99 percent. I was talking with someone the other day about the program down in my own section, and he said to me:

If the payments continue as they have been made during the time that the program has been in existence, those people are going to be landowners in a much shorter time than it was planned when they first took over those farms.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the language of this bill requires the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance this money, regardless of what Jesse Jones thinks about the soundness of any particular loan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assume that is so. I know when we first put this into the R. F. C. we did require a certain amount of collateral to be pledged with the R. F. C., and Mr. Jones had the right to pass on that.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the local committee, composed of outstanding farmers, pass upon the soundness of the loan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Absolutely. In my section we will have 10 times as many applicants as we can take care of and those committeemen, who are outstanding farmers in their respective precincts and counties, pass on every one of those loans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, one of the first official actions that I took upon being elected to Congress was in 1931, when I got a telegram from Mr. Hoover, who was then President of the United States. He wanted some pledges in advance of the meeting of Congress about the lending of money to the bankers and corporations of the United States, and referred to what he proposed regarding the establishment of the R. F. C. The country was then in turmoil. Banks and financial institutions were going bankrupt, and almost any wind that might blow could bring news of the collapse of big metropolitan banks which would result in financial chaos for the whole country. Well, we gave him the authority to advance and loan money to banks and financial institutions through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and since then the R. F. C. has been a very wonderful instrument in preserving the solvency of this country. Both and all political parties have embraced it and endorsed it.

Afterward the right of R. F. C. to lend money and its authority was extended to other people and other groups. It was extended, under the Bankhead-Jones Act, to farm tenants. A local committee decides upon the character and solvency of the men who get the money. These local committees go out and discover the men who are to be given the right to buy these tenant farms. One year ago I went over my district and visited these farms. I visited five of the tenant farmers and found every one of them to be doing well. They were raising families and educating their children in good Iowa farm homes, and paying their loans also. Where can you find any other institution or any other group of men that pays its obligations up to 99 percent?

Now, the question here today is as to whether we want home owners or whether we want landlords. Which will make a better civilization?

We are at war. Oh, yes; we are in the war; but whoever is going to fight for a boarding-house keeper or an absentee landlord?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday as I walked over to the House, another Member of Congress told me that he has some land down in my State, that he is not going to be able to farm it this year, because he has not been able to find tenants. If he were farming it, he would be growing something that would aid in this food-for-victory program.

So far as I know, there is no opposition to this part of the program. There are thousands upon thousands of good farm-tenant families who are looking for good land like our colleague owns. Sixty percent of the farm population of the United States today is in that category, in that class of nonoperators. Eighteen million people are farm tenants.

I think one of the most vicious practices under the American system is the practice of absentee ownership of land and the kind of farming we must get on that land if the owner lives in New York City or elsewhere. We are destroying the land, in the first place. We are destroying the individuals that must eke out a bare existence from that land, in the second place.

If you will turn to the hearings, you will see listed 11 pages of counties in the United States in which the Farm Tenant Act is being put into practice. You will see the counties in your own district, whether you live in the North, the South, the East, or the West, where deserving young men, usually they are young, and their families are able to live upon the farms that they themselves operate and eventually will own. Even though we are at war, surely we will not deny at this hour the right of these young people to continue to buy their own homes. Surely we will not destroy at this hour a program that has made one of the best records in the whole of the New Deal or in the whole of modern financing. Ninety-nine percent of all the loans have been repaid. You cannot find a record like that among the railroad loans or among any of the other big corporation loans that are also made by the R. F. C.

The Farm Tenant Act deserves to be continued, it cannot cost us anything as long as the money is being paid back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota to this extent that I believe loans which will make possible the production of additional food by the poor farmer group of this country are perhaps more insistently necessary than are loans to enable tenants to purchase farms; but I do not agree with him when he says, "What harm would it do if we abandoned this program?"

I think, unless a showing can be made, that money required for other purposes is to be put into it, a program with the

value of this one certainly ought not to be abandoned. My reason is this:

We are at war. We are at war for the purpose of the preservation of democracy. What does democracy mean? Democracy means a nation governing itself by means of majority rule, freely arrived at, with a constitutional democracy as a form of government. It also means a nation in which there is preserved as much as possible the freedom—economic, social, and political—of the individual person. Just let this concentration of land ownership proceed, just let the number of tenants, compared to farm owners, increase, just let the situation go on until you get great industrial and land monopolies existing side by side with homeless, wandering people, and it will be difficult, indeed, to preserve democracy.

This program has not cost the Government anything. Indeed, in the course of the next few years there will be as much being paid back as is being loaned out. In the last 10 years there have been a million and a quarter farms foreclosed in this country. The disappearance of the family-sized farm will be one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, tragedy this country has ever faced. This program is one small thing we have tried to do to stem that tide and turn it in the other direction.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned the fact that some of these people who received Bankhead-Jones loans have also received other loans. May I point out that in the case of other farmers a great many of them received land-bank loans in the first place and then production-credit loans in the second place. Anybody who knows anything about farming knows that if a man borrows the money in order to purchase a farm, that does not give him the necessary funds he may need to plant his crop the next year.

If you are going to conduct this thing on a sensible basis, you must, as another Member has said, protect the loans you have made. Indeed, I think the record speaks for itself on that point.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Illinois also pointed out that only 124 grants have been made, but the loans number in excess of 20,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, much that has been said in favor of the Farm Tenant Act is no doubt true. I am glad tenants have so very many defenders. I voted for the act. I voted for it in the committee on the supposition that it was to help the poor. But, gentlemen, are you aware that we are at war? The Congress sometimes seems unaware of it. I recently returned from the west coast. There they are war-conscious. Must the shrapnel break and the bombs fall in Washington before we wake up? Yes, I

would suspend this act now. I have an amendment to suspend this act for the time being, and if it is in order I should like to have a vote on it. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that it be read now for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pierce: On page 80, line 4, strike out the remainder of the page and page 81.

Mr. PIERCE. I admit some you say of the good things of the Farm Tenant Act, but, gentlemen, the whole future of this Republic is at stake in this war! There has been no record in history of anything like Pearl Harbor and the days that have followed it. We do not seem to realize that our boys are dying just a few thousand miles out there in the west. We must preserve every bit of financial strength we can. We will need it before this struggle is over.

I fear many of my colleagues do not understand the Japanese. There are many of them. They are out to fight to the death. It is the end of our institutions and the end of everything we have if we lose. We simply cannot lose, neither can we compromise. We must win. Therefore, we need to husband every bit of financial strength for war purposes.

I would not for a minute stop any of the activities for the benefit of the downtrodden, but I would suspend some which are as questionable and go to the well-to-do. I ask for a suspension of these activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear that fine patriotic appeal from the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]. The people out in the country are far in advance of us who are sitting here in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States. They realize that we are at war. They realize that it is absolutely necessary for us to quit monkeying around and get down to business and fight. If we do not fight there will not be farm tenancy, there will not be agricultural payments to the farmers, there will not be any opportunity for the laboring men to work for wages in this country. They will be slaves of Mr. Hitler and of the Japanese Emperor.

There is no use kidding ourselves about it. The more we dissipate our resources at this time the more we help Mr. Hitler and the Japanese.

This is a move, I hope, to cut down some of these expenditures. Let me say to you with respect to the amendment that will come with reference to farm loans, the committee has raised that figure from \$40,000,000 to \$45,000,000. Just think of it. Raised in such times as these from \$40,000,000 to \$45,000,000. It is perfectly ridiculous.

Last year there was not a loan of this kind made in my State. There is not a



tenant farmer in my State who is competent to run a farm who cannot buy one from a landowner who is delighted to sell it to him and will finance the operation. From the experience I have had I believe this same situation prevails throughout the Nation. Why should we set up a privileged class among the farm tenants? Why should we take some of them and make them the wards of the Government when we ought to be conserving every dollar there is in sight?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield.

I hope the amendment reducing the amount will prevail if the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] cutting it out, does not prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of an agency of our Government that is doing more good for more people than the Farm Security Administration. The question has been brought up here that we are at war and therefore we should cut out this appropriation. May I remind these distinguished gentlemen who have brought up that point that there are hundreds of thousands of young men in uniform who are baring their breasts to enemy bullets for the purpose of saving this country, including its land, whose parents do not own 1 foot of it, and neither do they. When they return we should have some kind of system built up where we can at least let them have the money, if they promise to pay it back, that will enable them to own a home. While they are away serving their country for \$21 or \$31 a month, the least we can do is to permit their good parents to borrow money through their Government, pay it back over a period of 40 years at 3-percent interest, for the purpose of owning a part of the earth that their sons are fighting for every day. This is the least we can do.

We have voted billions of dollars to bail out banks, insurance companies, and railroad companies and all other big corporations when they needed it. We have voted billions of dollars for our Allies. Little of it, if any, will ever be paid back. Do you not think the least thing we can do is to make it possible for these poor farmers, working the hardest kind of way with their hands in the fields from daylight to dark, to earn a home of their own? That is all we are attempting to do here. We are not giving them a penny. They are not asking for a cent. This is the best way to keep people off relief. This is the best way to preserve the American way of life and make it possible for people to own their own homes.

You could not point, I will say to my friends, to a better record of repayment than we have in the Tenant Purchase Act, and with that record of experience, which is an excellent one, let us not turn thumbs down on this appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the Jones-Bankhead Tenant Act is one of the most progressive measures which this Congress has passed in many years, and I say that for this reason: Proprietorship is absolutely necessary to build up great communities and strong States. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] well said, President Lincoln recognized the necessity of men having a land interest, a home, and for that reason, even during the darkest hour in this Nation's history up to this time, he advocated giving to the people land where they could have a home and have an interest in the community in which they lived.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have not time to yield.

Let me tell you that there are a lot of rural sections that are becoming decadent, with churches going to wrack and schools going down because the ownership is in town, and there is no longer any ownership in the occupants of the lands of that community. When these lands are foreclosed, who buys them? The man in the bank or some man in town, and he often has little interest in the local welfare of that community. But let these men who till the soil own the land, build their homes, and you have the greatest antidote to communism, fascism, and all the other "isms" that seek to destroy this civilization of ours. You never hear of a man who owns his home or the land he tills wanting to do anything to destroy that home or destroy the community in which he lives.

This is the program that puts land back into the hands of the man who tills the soil, and I want to tell you that if we continue this program, in the years to come we will see its fruits in a finer citizenship, in finer communities, in stronger States, and in a greater nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the statements made by many gentlemen on the floor of the House, in attempting to wipe out this very meritorious program. I believe that you gentlemen have in mind certain things that those in charge of this program are doing, that never were intended under any act, and that should be stopped. It is the purpose of the Agricultural Committee to put a stop to those activities. What are you proposing to do here under this amendment? I agree with my good friend from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] that this is a time when every citizen of this country should get down to work, to real business in trying to win this war, but I state to you that one of the most important parts of our national defense program is the production of sufficient food and fiber, not only to feed and clothe 130,000,000 Americans, but millions of our Allies who are struggling with us to win this war.

Let me call your attention to an item in this bill. On page 83 you have an item of fifty-three-million-odd dollars; for what? To build facilities—camps—to take care of migrants, people who have already left the farm, thousands of them,

drifting into the large cities, many of whom are on relief, and yet you propose to scrap this program that would keep people on the farm. You want to cut out \$10,000,000 that will keep people on the farm, and on page 83, as stated, you have an item of \$50,000,000 to take care of people who have already left the farm. Why did they leave the farm? They left because of the prices that they received for the things that they produce, and the high, fixed prices they had to pay for those things they had to buy.

I never hear any objection when the railroads or the business groups go down to the R. F. C., when they are permitted to borrow money, paying only 3-percent interest thereon, but as soon as the farmers of this country—the most patriotic group in the country—come in for a few paltry dollars to assist them to remain on the farm and become landowners, we have eminent, distinguished gentlemen, who know nothing about farming or what farmers have to contend with on the farm, standing up here and proposing to cut ten millions from this very meritorious item.

I want to call this to your attention—that is, it is impossible to build a successful national defense program unless you are able to have a successful agricultural program, and I predict that unless something is done to assist farmers to secure better farm prices and much-needed farm labor, as well as fertilizer materials and farm implements, we are going to wake up at the end of 1942 with a production far below normal instead of an increased production which will be needed to win this war. I want to state emphatically that the millions who are producing in our factories and the millions of our young men on the battlefields cannot make it with empty stomachs. I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the gentleman from Nebraska in talking about the farm, and what we could do to help the farmers. If you gentlemen had spent the money to put these fellows on the farm that you have spent in the last 8 years to put this country in the hole to the tune of forty billions of dollars, you would have had a farm by this time for every man, woman, and child in America. The trouble is that you have done so much boondoggling that you have not been able to get any farms for people.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Does the gentleman know how many loans have been made to tenants last year in Pennsylvania?

Mr. RICH. We haven't made so many in Pennsylvania, but you have made a lot of loans all over the country for the people on the farms, and if the people on the farms take advantage of it and be willing to work to their advantage and do more farming instead of having the country pay them for not farming, then those fellows would have had the farms, and they would not have had to bring this bill in here this afternoon. Here is a letter that was sent to me, and in it the writer says:

The worst part of the unnecessary spending is the adverse effect it has upon the sale of Defense bonds. When the ordinary citizen

is urged to buy his \$100 or \$500 worth of bonds for defense, and sees the money being voted for other purposes, he throws up his hands and refuses to buy bonds, because Congress will not cut, by even \$10,000, appropriations which he thinks are needless. He simply says, what is the use of putting my little money into bonds, when it will be wasted in Washington. Even in spending for defense projects economy should be the watchword. As has been well said, appropriations in themselves, do not furnish ships and planes.

I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this country are getting sick of what this Congress is doing, and I do not see anything but wreck ahead of us, the way this administration is running this Government and its waste and extravagance. We are in war now and you have got to economize; if you do not, the Nation is ruined.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know that 99 percent of these loans have been paid?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, let me clarify the parliamentary situation. The first vote will come on the reduction of \$1,250,000 in the administrative expenses for the operation of the Farm Tenant Act. Subsequent thereto will come the vote on the amendment offered by me to reduce the amount of the loans from \$45,000,000 to \$35,000,000. That will be a net reduction of \$10,000,000. As a matter of fact, it will be a net reduction of only \$5,000,000 below the Budget figure, because the Budget, in making up the estimate for 1943, suggested \$40,000,000, and the subcommittee has increased that amount by \$5,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman also explain the situation with reference to the substitute that I offered?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is also a substitute amendment pending offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which would reduce the loan amount from \$45,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

Mr. TABER. And the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] said he was going to offer a motion to strike out the entire section?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The entire section would be stricken if the amendment offered by the gentleman were adopted.

Mr. Chairman, in 4 years we bought 23,000 farms out of this program, out of \$75,000,000 in direct appropriation and \$100,000,000 in loans. We asked Mr. Baldwin when he came before the committee how many farms had changed hands in the year 1941. Here is his answer:

Estimated number of farms changing ownership as a result of foreclosures, assignments, or other conditions of credit distress during 12 months ended March 15, 1941, 575,000.

So, in 4 years we have provided an average of 6,000 farm-tenant purchasers, while there have been 575,000 changes of ownership. There you have a pretty fair index of the results we are going to achieve under this program.

Governor PIERCE, you are exactly right. We do not have any business buying land at a time when the Nation is in peril, any

more than we have business spending millions for soil conservation when boys are dying on the Bataan Peninsula. No. There is a great, grim problem before the country today, and there is dalliance in the Congress. If there is one spot in the United States where there is no proper alertness to the problem that faces the country today, it is here. We talk about lack of unity in the country. We talk about complacency among the people. The complacency is in Congress—not among the people. There will be unity whenever our decorum, our conduct, and the policies to which we give our hand and our direction will find favor among the people of the Nation.

I hope that one of these amendments is adopted. Mine only cuts it down \$10,000,000. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] cuts it \$25,000,000, and the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] cuts it \$45,000,000; but the first vote will be on the administrative expenses to save \$1,250,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for the remainder of the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, every Member present, I am sure, will recall the amendment I offered to the pending bill that reduced the appropriation more than any other one amendment that has been adopted or proposed to the measure. It is somewhat significant that at that time some of those who are now very actively supporting the Dirksen amendment in the name of economy were valiantly opposed to the amendment to place a limit of \$1,000 on soil-conservation payments. The big-shot farmers, many of whom never lived on a farm and yet who have been receiving from \$1,000 to \$10,000 in checks from the Federal Treasury, somehow were not interested in real economy then. It seems it depends altogether on whose ox is being gored—whose farmers are affected—as to whether some gentlemen present are really and truly for rigid economy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield briefly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The amendment that the gentleman proposed and had adopted the other day to reduce the benefit payments was not a saving to the Treasury, but it was a redistribution of that money so that the smaller farmers would get it instead of the big operators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I regret that I cannot agree with the gentleman. I was advised that my amendment, as originally offered, would have saved in excess of \$50,000,000. But the modified amendment, as passed, will not only be a protection to and for the small farmers, but if properly administered, an actual saving to the Treasury of many millions of dollars can and should be made.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say it is definite and certain that \$50,000,000 less will be appropriated for the

item in question this year than was spent last year for the so-called soil-conservation checks. I repeat that if the bill is administered properly and efficiently additional millions could easily be slashed from that item.

Now in the brief time I have, let me give briefly a history of this farm-tenant legislation that is now being attacked. A few years ago the Congress, after much consideration and investigation, by an overwhelming vote enacted what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. By the provisions of that act \$10,000,000 was authorized to be appropriated the first year; \$25,000,000 the second year, and \$50,000,000 was authorized thereafter. This Congress, I say, after careful consideration and much deliberation enacted that law. No one expected it to do anything like solve the distressing farm-tenant situation in 5, 10, or 15 years. Many of us had hoped that over a long period of time, with the Government spending \$50,000,000 annually that we could really make considerable headway toward solving one of the most perplexing economic problems that our country has faced during this generation.

Now, just in order to keep the record straight, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], were among the leaders who opposed the original Bankhead-Jones Act. Then, year after year, when the appropriation has been brought to the floor of this House to carry out the mandate of the Congress, the RECORD will disclose that some of the same gentlemen who are now so active in this well-organized and highly propagandized effort voted to cut this item by many millions of dollars.

The gentleman from Illinois, for whom I have a profound respect, and the able gentleman from New York are simply running true to form. They had a right to be against the original law. But it is significant that the burden of their argument in the beginning was that \$10,000,000, authorized for the first year, was entirely too little to do any real good. But now we hear the same gentlemen tell us that \$5,000,000 less than the amount authorized by law, to be expended in this great home-ownership program next year, is entirely too much. How consistent.

The gentleman from New York, who has from the beginning opposed this law, complains bitterly that no farms were purchased in the district he represents in Congress under the farm-tenancy program. I will not charge him with assuming the dog-in-the-manger attitude, but I cannot help but remind him that there is only 12.8 percent farm tenancy in the great State of New York as compared with Alabama which has 58.8 percent of farmers who do not own the farms on which they live, toil, and make their livelihood. More than 60 percent of the farmers of Oklahoma are in the same category. That is the same or similar situation of every State in the South.

I heartily agree with my good friend the distinguished and able gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] that this Congress must awaken to the fact that we are in the throes of a war, a war that



many of us are fearful will be a long, hard, bitter struggle; but I also agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the agriculture subcommittee, who is handling this measure in an admirable manner, that in the last analysis food will win the war. At the rate tenant farmers have been leaving the farms for the past 10 years, it is not improbable that there will be serious shortage of many food supplies if the present war continues as long as many of the so-called military and naval experts are now predicting.

To win the war America must not only have sufficient food for her armed forces and that of her Allies, but food for her civilian population. This food must be grown on farms and the work must be done by actual farmers. We cannot depend on the drug-store farmers or the agriculturists who live in the cities. When the rub comes, America must depend upon the little farmers to produce the foodstuffs. The increased need for food production cannot and will not be met on big farms or by the big farmers. They are now producing as much as they can without vast increases in the use of hired farm labor, and we might as well recognize the fact that many people who have been farm laborers in the past and others who might be willing to become farm laborers are now or soon will be in the armed forces of the United States or in the factories producing the tools to win the war. Increased production, therefore, must come from farmers who do their own labor. It must come from the working farmers, the dirt farmers of the country, who will give the Nation the essential food production to win the war.

Let me say here that I was somewhat surprised to hear the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] repeatedly make the assertion that funds carried in this bill to continue the farm-tenancy program were "taking money away from the school teachers and others and giving it to the farmers." I cannot believe the gentleman really meant what he said. I am sure that the distinguished and able gentleman understands full well that not a dollar of this fund is to be given to any farmer, and that every dollar furnished by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, headed by the Honorable Jesse Jones, in carrying out this great program will be returned to the Treasury with interest. Not a dollar has been lost to the Government under this program so far, and I am convinced that no funds will be lost in the future. An average of about 99 percent of these loans has been paid up to date, and in many instances farmers have paid 125 percent of the loan in order to save interest, and at the same time actually hasten the day when they will live under their own roofs and sit by their own firesides.

I know that the House is in a bad frame of mind this afternoon. I know also that many Members have been flooded with telegrams from many States in the Union to cut to the bone all non-defense activities of Government. Again I say I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with such a policy. But I hope that

Members will also remember that food played a major role in winning World War No. 1, and food may play even a greater part in winning the present struggle.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 93, noes 79.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. DIRKSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 109, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has an amendment pending at the desk, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 80, line 21, strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$35,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] offers a substitute for the Dirksen amendment. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 80, line 21, strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 84, noes 88.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. TARVER.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman cannot interrupt a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote has not started.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We had already started to vote on the substitute and the Chair had announced the vote as 84 to 88.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers had not taken their places.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we had started the vote when the first voice vote was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Georgia moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question is on the motion.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia and Mr. TARVER.

The Committee divided.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order: There are a couple of gentlemen who voted both ways, but I shall make no point of it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to change my vote.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Has not a Member the right to change his vote if he so desires?

Mr. TARVER. I am not raising any objection.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 92, noes 123.

So the Committee refused to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Case substitute amendment.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 120, noes 104.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment as amended by the Case substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PIERCE: On page 80, beginning at line 4, strike out the remainder of the page and all of page 81.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PIERCE) there were—ayes 93, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including (1) farm-debt-adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior law; (2) loans; (3) grants; (4) the prosecution of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration on July 1, 1941; (5) projects involving provision of water facilities; and (6) projects involving construction and operation of migratory labor camps, \$50,319,557, together with not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made under this head for the fiscal year 1942, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of law-books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, maintenance, and exchange at the seat of government and elsewhere, of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 83, line 3, strike out "\$50,319,557" and insert "\$25,319,557."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object if we may have an understanding that I might have a similar length of time in order to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no confusion about it, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the item of \$50,000,000 carried in this bill is broken up about as follows: For farm and home management assistance, \$18,500,000; for farm-debt adjustment, a little over \$13,000,000; for servicing loans and grants, \$12,500,000; for rural rehabilitation projects, \$350,000; for migratory labor camps, \$3,500,000; for administration, \$7,500,000.

Most of this money goes to salaries, supplies, and mileage. I want to tell my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who sits here in a front seat, that the travel for the farm security out of this item for the fiscal year 1943, when all put together, will be \$7,414,000. You talk about migrants in the West? Why, the Security Administration supervisors are the migrants who will be riding the lower berths and the bedrooms on the fine Pullman cars of the country, spending \$7,000,000 for mileage.

They will have 19,448 people on the pay roll. Doing what? Let me tell you what they say in their own justification.

Farm and home management supervisors will work personally with each borrower. They will give assistance to clients in planning management practices, including land use and labor use. They will advise on the use of certified seed and purebred sires. They will advise on high-analysis fertilizer and feed rations. They will advise on crop management and livestock management.

Here is a great plan for cooperative service, and they propose to spend \$18,500,000 for that. We will also pay out of that fund 2,755 fine ladies who will go into the farm homes of the country to tell them how to cook and prepare food for freedom.

There will be 4,327 county farm-management supervisors to tell them about purebred sires and certified seed. Great conscience, there are 7,000 on the extension pay roll now doing an identical kind of work, not to speak of the thousands of 3-A committeemen who are operating in all the 48 States of the Union. There never was such a travesty in all the Gov-

ernment as the Farm Security Administration program for rural rehabilitation loans, which comes as close to 100 percent paternalism as anything I have ever seen.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The item which the gentleman is seeking to cut is the administrative expenses and not the amount which is used for loans, which is in the next paragraph?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. I want to reduce some of this \$7,000,000 for mileage; I want to chop down some of this \$18,000,000 for the home-management and the farm-management people, who are going from one end of the country to the other; I want to chop down some of the \$149,000 that they are spending in mileage for the migrant camps out on the west coast and elsewhere. They took care of 15,000 or 20,000 people last year, and the supervisors are now going to travel \$149,000 worth in 1943. They are the real migrants instead of the migrants for whom they entertain such paternal solicitude in some of the areas of the western section of the country.

This is one of those awful things. If I had time, I could go on to tell you about their experiments in community planning, their experiments in communal farming in the country, their experimentation in setting up defense relocation corporations made up of employees of the Farm Security Administration, taking over vast sections of land as, for instance, the Scully estate in Missouri, embracing 40,000 acres, using their own employees to set up the corporation, and doing an act which a former Member of this House, Lindsey Warren, presently the Comptroller General of the United States, regarded as illegal and as in excess of the authority which the Farm Security Administration possesses under existing law.

There is only one way you will stop these abuses, and that is by a good, healthy cut. The amendment on the desk now proposes to reduce this item from \$50,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, from every quarter we are daily admonished that in times like these all must make sacrifices. But there seems to be a general agreement on the part of industry, labor, and transportation that most of the sacrificing should be done by the farmers. They make no offer to cut the price of any of the war munitions they are producing but they are all agreed that the farmer should take subparity prices for the indispensable war rations he is producing. And no bill has been more severely criticized or more bitterly attacked than the farm appropriation bill notwithstanding the fact that it has been more drastically reduced than any of the supply bills reported to the House this session of Congress.

But even with the reductions made by the committee it is still a comprehensive bill and carries guaranties of farm prices

and farm income without which the lot of the American farmer would be untenable. One of the greatest victories ever won for agriculture was won yesterday when recognition of farm parity was reenacted and reaffirmed by permanent incorporation in the bill. All such essentials maintaining and stabilizing farm prices and farm income must be indomitably defended against every assault. But the nonessentials we can afford to cut. And this is a nonessential. On such defensible items as these we can afford to retrench in the Nation's wartime budgets.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a very short question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska who has contributed so largely to sound agricultural legislation. Without his able counsel and support it would have been impossible to have secured enactment of the first appropriation for parity payments.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the Dirksen amendment affect the land-purchase program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would affect merely the number and salaries of personnel, the amount to be expended for travel and other administrative expenses.

Mr. STEFAN. It covers administrative expenses, but it does not affect the land-purchase program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It covers administration only and does not affect the program itself. Of course, the less of the appropriation spent for unnecessary administrative expense, the more you will have for the farmer.

The provision here for administrative expenses is out of all proportion to the amount ultimately reaching the farmer. Out of every \$3 of this appropriation \$1 goes to the administrators and only \$2 reaches the farmer. For every dollar which reaches the farmer, a half-dollar is absorbed en route. This heavy expense of administration is due to unwarranted repetition, overlapping, and duplication which can be eliminated at a saving of millions of dollars without affecting the service to those whom the appropriation is intended to benefit.

The hearings before the subcommittee reporting the bill and the widely published accounts of the hearings before the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures last month are convincing proof of the necessity of reducing this top-heavy appropriation for administrative expense.

It is a disservice to the farm cause and to the farmers for whom these appropriations are ostensibly made, to load this bill down with heavy sums which can be reduced without affecting the service. All such appropriations should be cut to the bone in order to justify all the more convincingly the necessity of retaining the really essential items in the bill. It is up to us to attend to our own household and make voluntary reductions in every reducible item in order to more consistently justify our demand for items which cannot be



reduced. I trust the House will appreciate our fairness and our willingness to economize where economy is possible and hope it will cooperate with us in our efforts to enact a consistent bill by joining with us in voting for the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think if you go back into Wisconsin you will find that the farmers of that State feel that I am as good a friend as they have in the State of Wisconsin, especially in my own district. I know what the good farmers are thinking about the amount of money that is being spent here for agriculture, and I hear it from every farmer that I talk to that they want to reduce the expenses of this Government. They are perfectly willing to do their share in doing it.

I was very glad to hear the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations tell you that this travel expense is unnecessary because, in my opinion, it ought to be cut out. I should like to know where we are going to get the people to do the fighting in this war if we have these fellows running around interfering in every farmer's business. What the farmer wants to do today is to get rid of these men who have been advising him for 6 or 7 years now, because he feels now that he knows the program of the Government and is perfectly willing to carry it out if he is given an opportunity to do so.

Now we must get some of these men off the pay roll. I do not know whether you realize the tremendous increase in the appropriations for agriculture or not, but I pointed out here on the floor a few days ago how we have increased the appropriations from about \$38,000,000 in 1918, to about \$1,300,000,000 last year. A large amount of this money, as pointed out by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is spent upon men who go around and take up the time of the good farmer who wants to get his work done in giving him advice. He has now had all the advice he needs or wants, and he is perfectly willing we should take some of these fellows, at least, and put them out on the farm working or put them in the Army where they can do some fighting.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. One of these men said, "I have a book here with some instructions, so you can do much better." He said, "I don't need it; I ain't doing as well as I know now."

Mr. JOHNS. I think there is something in that. Personally, I think the good farmers of this country are able to take care of themselves with the amount of money they are getting, and yesterday we gave them parity, and we are going to see that they get the prices for their products, and that is all the farmers want. I do hope that this Congress can appreciate what the people are thinking back home, not only with this farm program but every program that comes along

here for appropriations. We know there are a number of people who are useless in each one of these departments, and we will help by eliminating them as much as we possibly can and save this money for our national defense.

I hope this amendment will be adopted, and I trust the Democrats will join with the Republicans and the Republicans with the Democrats in seeing that it is done.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can reach an agreement as to closing debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that if we had 20 minutes that ought to do?

Mr. TARVER. We have read only one paragraph of the provisions for rural rehabilitation, and closing debate on this paragraph would not have anything to do with closing debate on the paragraph authorizing \$70,000,000 in loans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto may be limited to 1 hour, the last 10 minutes to be controlled by the committee in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOOK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, it seems rather queer that when some Members get up and ask for extra time of 5 minutes they get it, but when some other Members interested in the proposition get up here to speak they try to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6709 the agricultural appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight to file conference report on the bill S. 2208.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by the Executive Assistant to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include certain telegrams and tables therein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include a letter from the Office of Price Administration in connection with the sugar appropriation item discussed here today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today in the Committee of the Whole and include a letter from Secretary Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### WAKE UP AMERICA

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I give credit for some information I desire to give to the House for the next 5 minutes to an editorial from the New York World-Telegram and the Daily Oklahoman, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, wake up America—it's late.

The Nation needs to awaken to the full gravity of the peril that confronts it.

It needs to appreciate how badly we have been defeated in 3 months of war.

It needs to understand that it is possible for the United Nations and the United States to lose this war and suffer the fate of France—and that this possibility may become a probability if the present tide does not change.

It needs to realize that there is grave chance of the Japanese pushing through India and the Germans driving through the Near East to join their armies and resources in an almost unbeatable combination.

It needs to get away, once and for all, from the comforting feeling that while we may lose at the start we are bound to win in the end.

Only when fully aware of existing perils will the United States do its utmost. Pray God that awareness will not come too late, as it did in France.

Production Director Donald Nelson appeals for vastly increased industrial output on a 24-hour, 7-day basis—168 hours a week. Maximum production, in short.

Can we get it?

Not on the present basis—not under the psychology of recent years.

Not until we quit thinking in terms of less work for more money.

Not while there is greater concern about overtime pay than overtime production.

Not while politicians are more interested in higher prices than raising more essentials.

Not while Government bureaus—created to meet a depression emergency that is ended—continue to grab for themselves money needed for armaments.

Not while an army of Federal press agents clamors to promote and perpetuate activities that have no present need or value.

Not while Congressmen try to put over useless canals and river schemes and take up the time of defense officials clamoring for factories and contracts as if war were a great gravy train.

Not while strikes hamper war production, despite a solemn promise that they would stop.

Not while the life-and-death need for uninterrupted production is used as a weapon to put over the closed shop.

Not while double time is demanded for Sunday work or time-and-a-half in excess of a 40-hour week.

Not while a man cannot be employed on an Army project or in a war plant until he pays \$20 to \$500 or more to a labor racketeer.

Not while criminal gangs control employment and allocation of men to work on the *Normandie* and the other ships along New York's vast water front.

Not while fifth columnists are pampered and enemy aliens move freely in defense areas.

Not while the grim job of preparing our home communities against air raids and sabotage is gummed up with a lot of highfalutin, boondoggling, social-service activity.

Not while pressure blocs clamor for higher benefits and bounties.

We will not get maximum production, in short, unless, first, we fully realize our awful peril; and, second, get over the "gimmies" of recent years, such as:

"Gimme shorter hours, gimme higher wages, gimme bigger profits, gimme more overtime, gimme less work, gimme more appropriations and patronage, gimme plants for my congressional district, gimme fees and dues to work for Uncle

Sam, gimme ham and eggs, gimme share-the-wealth."

France had the "gimmies," too—had them till the Germans were close to Paris. Then everybody went frantically to work—too late.

France has no "gimmies" today—except "gimme food for my baby, gimme a place to lay my head, gimme death."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address by our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SOUTH). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an article from the New York Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, also, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution from the Puerto Rican Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an article from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MERRITT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 13, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on Friday, March 13, 1942, at 10 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 6483 and House Joint Resolution 290. The hearing will be held in the caucus room, Old House Office Building.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, April 14, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearings along the line of the Sanders bill, H. R. 5497, and other matters connected with the Federal Communications Commission.

##### COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet Friday, March 13, at 10:30 a. m., in room 353, House Office Building, to continue hearings on the bill H. R. 6522.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1486. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of chapter XIX of the Army Appropriation Act approved July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 392; 33 U. S. C. 3), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARTER: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 2989. A bill to authorize the use of a tract of land in California known as the Millerton Rancheria in connection with the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 622. A bill authorizing the Snake or Plute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 2208. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war (Rept. No. 1896). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 6778. A bill to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6782. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the Detective Bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction; to the Committee on Labor.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 6779. A bill authorizing the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America to purchase certain public land on



Spruce Island, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 6780. A bill for the relief of J. M. Jesse; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 6781. A bill for the relief of Frank Novak, as guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2552. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of Adjt. Paul La Teer, Karl Ross Post, No. 16, Inc., the American Legion, Stockton, Calif., relative to the gearing of our war industries to the highest speed possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2553. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of W. H. Crutcher, of Topeka, Kans., and 88 others, favoring the immediate passage of the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, March 5, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of Truth, Who are the revealer of secrets, Who dost open the heart to perceive and to understand: Help us, guide us in our uncertainties, and bring us through the inward mists and confusions induced by whatever there be of insincerity in us, to the firm ground of stalwart resolution and definite conviction.

Spirit of Liberty, by whose operation are the emancipations of the human soul, give us the freedom of trust and courage, the freedom of the open and responsive mind, and by these freedoms do Thou enable us to triumph over whatever necessary toil and strife we may be called upon to endure.

Spirit of Life, make us ever responsive to the beauty and the claim of things that are eternal. Indwell us, we beseech Thee, that we may live within these shadows and the narrow bounds of time the fuller life that is yielded by what we are, no less than by what we do, the life betokening our immortality, as it is transfigured by the presence of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 12, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its read-

ing clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2249) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy, additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### RELIEF OF G. F. ALLEN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

##### EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of oil and gas leases, which by their terms would expire in 1941, but by reason of their inclusion in an approved unit plan are extended beyond their initial 20-year term until the termination of such plan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

##### PAYMENTS UNDER SEVERAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report containing the names and addresses of payees who received \$1,000 or more and showing the amount of payment to each payee for participation in the 1940 programs administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; also a statement showing the estimated number of payees and percentage distribution by size groups under the 1940 conservation and parity payment programs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

##### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall yield to any Senator who desires to present routine business or to incorporate something in the RECORD, but that is as far as the Senator from Illinois is going to yield today. I want to get through my argument. I yield for the purpose I have indicated.

(Mr. WHITE presented a petition of citizens of Corinth, Maine, relative to Senate bill 860, which appears under the appropriate heading.)

##### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation to include total and permanent disability benefits in war-risk insurance; to the Committee on Finance. (See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. VANDENBERG on the 11th instant, p. 2232. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation to designate as a military road a highway from Detour to Sault Ste. Marie, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs. (See

resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. VANDENBERG on the 2d instant, p. 1808, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Whereas a few weeks after the United States entered the war against the totalitarian countries, the North American Congress passed an act providing war insurance to give indemnity for the damages that might be suffered by reason of air attacks, a large sum of money being appropriated for such purpose;

"Whereas as soon as the United States entered the war against the totalitarian countries, the Puerto Rican people offered the United States their moral and material support in favor of the cause defended by the North American Nation;

"Whereas, the Island of Puerto Rico, on account of the naval and army bases constructed therein, has acquired strategic value and great military importance to such an extent that the towns and cities where said bases have been, or are being, constructed are practically military objectives and may be, at any time, the object of unforeseen attacks and aerial bombardments, the urban property being exposed to serious damage: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

"First. To request the Congress of the United States, as it is hereby requested, that the war insurance passed and provided for by said Congress be made extensive to Puerto Rico.

"Second. That a copy of this resolution be sent by the most rapid way possible to the Honorable President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to the Honorable President of the United States Senate, to the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable BOLIVAR PAGAN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico to the United States."

By Mr. WHITE:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Corinth and vicinity, in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the seventieth annual farmers' convention assembled at Sandy Spring, Md., protesting against the enactment of legislation placing a ceiling over farm commodity prices without a like control being placed over wage scales; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Marion and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

#### RESOLUTION BY THE SUNDAY SCHOOL OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, HOPE, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution recently adopted by the Sunday school of the First Baptist Church of Hope, Kans., to the effect that fruits and grains now used for the manufacture of intoxicating liquor be diverted